



Policy and Resources Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2021

Time: 1.45 pm

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL
([HTTPS://YOUTU.BE/K-VPCZDIZLK](https://youtu.be/k-VPCzDizLk))
(<https://youtu.be/k-VPCzDizLk>)

Members:

| | |
|--|---|
| Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair) | The Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor Vincent Thomas Keaveny (Ex-Officio Member) |
| Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman) | Alderman Ian Luder |
| Deputy Keith Bottomley (Vice-Chairman) | Alderman & Sheriff Nicholas Lyons |
| Deputy Tom Sleigh (Vice-Chair) | Jeremy Mayhew |
| Rehana Ameer | Andrew McMurtrie |
| Nicholas Bensted-Smith (Ex-Officio Member) | Wendy Mead |
| Tijs Broeke | Deputy Andrien Meyers |
| Anne Fairweather | Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner) (Ex-Officio Member) |
| Marianne Fredericks | Deputy Alastair Moss (Ex-Officio Member) |
| Tracey Graham (Ex-Officio Member) | Ruby Sayed (Ex-Officio Member) |
| Alderman Timothy Hailes | Alderman Baroness Scotland (Ex-Officio Member) |
| Caroline Haines | Sir Michael Snyder |
| Deputy Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member) | Deputy James Thomson (Ex-Officio Member) |
| Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark | Mark Wheatley |
| Shravan Joshi | Deputy Philip Woodhouse |
| Deputy Edward Lord | Alderman Sir David Wootton |

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

Accessing the public meeting

Members of the Public can observe this public meeting through the following link:
<https://youtu.be/k-VPCzDizLk>

Lunch will be served for Members in the Guildhall Club at 1PM

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 18th November 2021

For Decision

(Pages 7 - 18)

- b) To note the draft public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 19th November 2021

For Information

(Pages 19 - 26)

- c) To note the draft public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 17th November 2021

For Information

(Pages 27 - 34)

4. **ACT OF COMMON COUNCIL - NATIONALITY REQUIREMENT FOR ALDERMEN AND PRESIDING OFFICER AT WARDMOTE**

Joint report of the Comptroller and City Solicitor and Town Clerk & Chief Executive.

For Decision

(Pages 35 - 50)

5. **REVIEW OF FUNDING TO THE GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC & DRAMA FOR SCHOLARSHIPS**

Report of the Principal, Guildhall School of Music and Drama.

For Decision

(Pages 51 - 52)

6. **2022/23 PAY POLICY STATEMENT**

Report of the Director of Human Resources.

For Decision

(Pages 53 - 84)

7. **CITY JUNIOR SCHOOL GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE**
Joint report of the Head of City of London School and Head of City of London School for Girls.

For Decision
(Pages 85 - 94)
8. **CAPITAL FUNDING - PRIORITISATION OF 2022//23 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS - INITIAL REVIEW**
Report of the Chamberlain.

For Decision
(Pages 95 - 106)
9. **ELECTORAL REGISTRATION**
Joint report of the Comptroller and City Solicitor and Town Clerk & Chief Executive (TO FOLLOW).

For Decision
10. **POLICY INITIATIVES FUND AND COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY**
Report of the Chamberlain.

For Information
(Pages 107 - 114)
11. **DISCHARGE OF SEWAGE INTO THE RIVER THAMES**
Resolution of the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee.

(Pages 115 - 116)
12. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**
Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 117 - 118)
13. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
14. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
15. **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

16. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

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

- a) To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting of Policy and Resources Committee held on 18th November 2021.

For Decision
(Pages 119 - 124)

- b) To note the draft non public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 19th November 2021

For Information
(Pages 125 - 128)

- c) To note the draft non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 17th November 2021

For Information
(Pages 129 - 138)

- d) To note the non-public minutes of the Tackling Racism Taskforce meeting held on 17th September 2021.

For Information
(Pages 139 - 142)

- e) To note the draft non public minutes of the Culture Mile Working Party meeting held on 25th October 2021

For Information
(Pages 143 - 146)

17. **ALLOCATION OF THREE INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS FUNDING WITH THE SCHOOLS FUNDING MODEL**

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Decision
(Pages 147 - 160)

18. **TOM AND GOVERNANCE REVIEW: COL INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS**

Joint report of the Head of the City of London Freemen's School, Head of the City of London School for Girls, Head of the City of London and Town Clerk and Chief Executive.

For Decision
(Pages 161 - 176)

19. **CITY OF LONDON PRIMARY ACADEMY ISLINGTON - CAPITAL FUNDING AND TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION COSTS**

Report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.

For Decision
(Pages 177 - 186)

20. **CITY OF LONDON'S SUPPORT FOR KEY PARTNERS**

Report of the Director of Innovation and Growth.

For Decision
(Pages 187 - 196)

21. **NON PUBLIC DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR
URGENCY POWERS**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information
(Pages 197 - 198)

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

23. **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

24. **TO AGREE THE CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES OF THE POLICY AND RESOURCES
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 18 NOVEMBER 2021**

For Decision

25. **DESTINATION CITY - INDEPENDENT REVIEW**

Report of the Director of Innovation & Growth.

For Decision

26. **PROPOSALS FOR THE ORGANISATIONAL DESIGN OF PROJECT
GOVERNANCE AND THE ROLE OF THE HEAD OF PROFESSION FOR PROJECT
GOVERNANCE AND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT**

Report of the Chief Operating Officer.

For Decision

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Thursday, 18 November 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall (live-streamed at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pkj_MftGKfk) on Thursday, 18 November 2021 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)
Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Keith Bottomley (Vice-Chairman)
Rehana Ameer
Nicholas Bensted-Smith (Ex-Officio Member)
Tijs Broeke
Anne Fairweather
Marianne Fredericks
Alderman Timothy Hailes
Deputy Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Shravan Joshi
Deputy Edward Lord
Alderman Ian Luder
Jeremy Mayhew
Andrew McMurtrie
Wendy Mead
Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner) (Ex-Officio Member)
Ruby Sayed (Ex-Officio Member)
Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy James Thomson (Ex-Officio Member)
Alderman Sir David Wootton

In Attendance

Munsur Ali
John Chapman
Jason Pritchard
Oliver Sells

Officers:

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Caroline Al-Beyerty | - Chamberlain |
| Michael Cogher | - Comptroller and City Solicitor |
| Paul Double | - City Remembrancer |
| Damian Nussbaum | - Director of Innovation & Growth |
| Bob Roberts | - Director of Communications |
| Emma Moore | - Chief Operating Officer |
| Gregory Moore | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Dionne Corradine | - Chief Strategy Officer |

| | |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Ian Hughes | - Department of the Built Environment |
| Sam Hutchings | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Jack Joslin | - City Bridge Trust |
| Richard Messingham | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Christopher Rumbles | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Peter Lisley | - City Surveyor's Department |
| Sian Bird | - Innovation & Growth |
| Sandeep Dwesar | - Barbican Centre |
| Simon Johnson | - Barbican Centre |

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Anne Fairweather, Tracey Graham, Deputy Andrien Meyers, Deputy Tom Sleigh, Mark Wheatley, Deputy Philip Woodhouse, and the Rt Hon The Lord Mayor.

The Chair referred to Karina Dostalova's recent departure from the Court of Common Council and took the opportunity to thank her for her valued contribution to the City Corporation and to wish her well for the future.

The Chair similarly remarked on Alderman William Russell's departure from the Committee following the completion of his term as Lord Mayor and also thanked him for his valuable contributions during his time on the Committee.

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 14 October 2021 were approved.
- b) The public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 15 September 2021 were noted.
- c) The public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 20 October 2021 were noted.
- d) The public minutes of the Public Relations Sub-committee meeting held on 18 October 2021 were noted.
- e) To public summary of the Competitiveness Advisory Board meeting held on 11 October 2021 was noted.

4. **GOVERNANCE REVIEW: COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk that presented the outcomes of the consultation sessions held with Members in working through Lord Lisvane's Governance Review findings, and which sought approval for a

proposed committee structure and processes for implementation moving forward.

The Chair and Deputy Chairman took the opportunity to introduce the item. The Chair acknowledged the complex work that had been involved in pulling together the views of all Members, whilst also ensuring the aims of the review were being fulfilled, which it was felt had largely been achieved through the proposals presented. The Chair emphasised how the proposals were about more than simply cutting down on the number of committees; they were about streamlining business at the City Corporation through revising its structures and processes, with the proposals presenting the evolution needed to achieve this.

The Deputy Chairman remarked on the fundamental importance of the Review and referred to the exhaustive Member consultation sessions that had taken place, thanking all Members for their participation and the many views they had offered. The most recent informal meeting of Court of Common Council had also allowed for a very helpful discussion on the proposals during which a number of issues had been raised, specifically relating the implementation of term limits, questions relating to Freedom's Application Committee, the Barbican Podium and housing, on which the views of Policy and Resources Committee would be particularly welcomed today.

The Deputy Chairman confirmed the intention being to finalise proposals today for presentation at December Court of Common Council, with a view to achieving implementation in time for the new municipal year in April 2022. He added that no processes would be set in stone as it was recognised that tweaks or adjustments may be necessary once processes were put into working practice. It was confirmed that a light touch review would be held in due course as a result, to reflect on the changes and consider how the new processes were working. During the discussion that followed the following areas of consideration were raised: -

- With reference to the issue of term limits, the Committee agreed that there was no need to introduce a uniform approach or specific term limits on committees unless there was an external requirement to do so or the committee in question made the case for the benefits in their particular circumstance. It was suggested that the practice of Members having to seek re-election by the Court on a regular basis was already somewhat akin to term limits, with it added that imposing strict term limits could potentially result in losing invaluable lived-in experience that allowed for a Committee to keep progressing and to avoid repeating previous discussions.
- There was a suggestion from a Member that increased flexibility with the timing of meetings could be explored to allow for greater participation in meetings. Officers were encouraged to start the process of thinking through this issue to inform future consideration.

- It was recognised that Members could continue to look at the same volume of papers; there was a need to move to a more strategic level of focus for Members and away from micro-managing.
- A Member asked that a comprehensive list be provided detailing those outside bodies to which the City Corporation appointed, as well as clarification on the rules of attendance or observer status at internal meetings of the Court and its sub-committees and working parties.
- With reference to the Freedom Applications Committee, it was agreed that this would be better as a stand-alone Sub-Committee of Policy & Resources and not folded into the new Civic Affairs Sub-Committee.
- Some queries were raised regarding the proposals for a single Housing Committee and clarity sought as to how this would work in practice; there was a need to think through the City Corporation's statutory requirement relating to housing. Members noted the general consensus at Informal Court for the new governance arrangements relating to housing and in looking to provide a single point of focus across all the City Corporation's estates. A Member added that there was a need to ensure each Housing Estate had an opportunity to have their voice heard as part of any new Committee.
- In response to a query, it was clarified that asset allocation already fell within the remit of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, but that there was a clear need to manage this more effectively.
- Consideration was given to the Barbican Podium and where this should sit. It was suggested the site should rest within Open Spaces and City Gardens Committee's remit given the area was an enormous open space; however, noting the significant changes that were already underway within Open Spaces through the implementation of a new Target Operating Model, it was agreed that it would be best not to confuse issues at this time by adding the podium as an additional area of responsibility.
- Issues relating to the remit of Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee (CH&LC) were discussed, specifically a proposal that the committee absorb responsibility for sport and with responsibility for London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) being transferred to a new body.
- Several Members raised their opposition to a separate Board for the (LMA), arguing that it would not be helpful at this time to disaggregate the joined-up working of cultural activity. It was suggested this proposal could be considered further at some future date, but with it being important to first work through how the City Corporation would work with the LMA moving forward before separating it out. The Committee supported this approach.
- With reference to the question of sport, whilst it was acknowledged that there were significant benefits to be accrued through a more joined-up and strategic approach to sport, and that there was a natural link with Culture,

some concerns were expressed over the detail of operational delivery in local areas, particularly the open spaces, and how this would interface. It was agreed that the proposed changes should not be pursued at this time, but be the subject of further consideration.

The Chair and Deputy Chairman thanked Members for their views. The Chair noted the clear steer on term limits and the proposal to leave it to Members to decide who should serve on a committee and with this remaining a decision for the Court. The positions in respect of the LMA, Sport, the Freedom Applications Sub-Committee, and the Barbican Podium were also noted. The Deputy Chairman welcomed Members support in taking forward the package of proposals on this basis.

RESOLVED: That Members approve the recommendation as set out within the report, subject to the above additional recommendations relating to Freedom Applications Committee, Barbican Podium, London Metropolitan Archives and Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee.

5. REVISED SCHEME OF DELEGATIONS TO OFFICERS

Members considered a report of the Deputy Town Clerk setting out proposed changes to the Scheme of Delegations (SoD).

The Chair noted the various changes proposed and suggested that officers could perhaps have been more ambitious in their requests, but felt that the proposals represented a good starting point. The Chair stressed that the City Corporation was a Member-led organisation which must be borne in mind; consequently, Members needed to be happy with the proposals here. It was hoped these would lead to more streamlined, agile decision making through granting more trust to officers.

A Member, also Chairman of Finance Committee, welcomed the changes that had been made following an initial pushback to officers from Resource Allocation Sub-Committee. The Member suggested that there was still more that could be done but suggested this could be achieved as part of a regular review of the Scheme of Delegations moving forward. It was suggested the proposed changes be implemented and for these to be reflected upon and reviewed in due course to understand if any further changes would be required.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

1. Approve revisions made to the Scheme of Delegations to date, for onwards submission to the Court.
2. Approve that going forward, to ensure continued Member oversight, periodic reports of action taken be submitted to service committees.
3. Agree that, to ensure good governance, the SoD should be reviewed on an annual basis.

6. MEMBER/ OFFICER CHARTER

The Committee considered a joint report of the Comptroller and City Solicitor and Town Clerk and Chief Executive setting out a draft Member / Officer Charter.

The Town Clerk referred to the item having recently been considered and supported by Establishment Committee, during which there had been a discussion around a need to recognise relationships between Members and officers. In response to this, the Comptroller proposed a new paragraph 2.4 to deal with relationships as follows: -

“Close personal relationships between members and officers will require careful consideration and handling by both parties to ensure that they comply with the principles and requirements of the Members’ Code of Conduct, the Officers’ Code of Conduct and the seven Principles of Public Life (selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership)”.

Members were fully supportive of the charter, with it considered important to have in place to deal with the conduct of a minority of Members. However, there was some disquiet as to the proposed wording at the new Paragraph 2.4, particularly in relation to the definition of “close personal relationships”.

Following detailed discussion and consideration of the wording there was agreement reached that the words “Close personal relationships” should be replaced with the words “intimate, business or financial relationships” as an appropriate form of wording.

The Chief Operating Officer assured Members that the Employee Handbook would be updated with an equivalent form of wording to reflect the decision taken.

RESOLVED: That Members approve the proposed Member / Officer Charter for submission to the Court as set out in the report, subject to the inclusion of an additional agreed Paragraph 2.4 (as set out within the body of the above minute) to deal with relationships between Members / Officers.

7. RIVERSIDE STRATEGY FOR ADOPTION

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment seeking approval for adoption of the City of London Riverside Strategy 2021.

A Member expressed concern that the appendix to the report might fall short of obligations in respect of accessibility requirements and an undertaking was provided to address this.

RESOLVED: That Members approve the text of the draft Riverside Strategy for adoption.

8. SPORT ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Communications updating on the work of the Sports Engagement Manager in delivering the City of London Corporation’s sport engagement programme.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

1. Note the progress being made on the City Corporation's sport engagement programme.
2. Agree to allocate £75,000 from the Policy Initiatives Fund towards sport engagement activity for 2022/23.

9. **CITY OF LONDON ACADEMIES TRUST BOARD OF TRUSTEES: APPOINTMENT OF SPONSOR TRUSTEE**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk presenting a proposed candidate as a Policy and Resources Committee representative on the City of London Academies Trust in accordance with the Sponsor Trustees' Appointment Policy.

RESOLVED: That Members approve the appointment of Common Councillor Ben Murphy as a Sponsor Trustee of the City of London Academies Trust Board of Trustees for a four-year term commencing 18 November 2021.

10. **CULTURE AND COMMERCE TASKFORCE: A YEAR OF FUELLING CREATIVE RENEWAL**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Innovation & Growth presenting the City Corporation's final report for its Culture & Commerce Taskforce *A Year of Fuelling Creative Renewal*.

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

11. **ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY IN PROCUREMENT**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Operating Officer providing an update on the Purchased Goods and Service action plan as part of the Climate Action Strategy and Sustainability in Procurement.

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

12. **ELECTIONS BILL 2021**

The Committee received a report of the Remembrancer updating on proposed changes to electoral administration as part of the Elections Bill.

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

13. **NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS COMMISSION & REVIEW OF LONDON'S PREPAREDNESS TO RESPOND TO A MAJOR TERRORIST INCIDENT**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk providing an update on the National Preparedness Commission work and the review of London's preparedness for a major terrorist incident.

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

14. **POLICY AND RESOURCES CONTINGENCY/DISCRETIONARY FUNDS**

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain providing the schedule of projects and activities which had received funding from the Policy Initiatives Fund, the Policy and Resources Committee's Contingency Fund, Committee's Project Reserve and COVID19 Contingency Fund.

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

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

The Committee received a report of the Town Clerk updating Members on action taken by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and 41(b) since the last meeting.

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

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

There were no questions.

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

The following item of business was raised.

Water Charge Refunds for Secure Tenants

A Member suggested the discussion on this item later on the agenda should be held during public session. If the item was to be considered in non-public session, the Member proposed any vote on the item be made public.

The Director of Community and Children's Services confirmed the decision to consider the item in non-public had been reached following legal advice of Counsel. The Comptroller noted the item was due to be considered in non-public owing to sensitive data included within the report and suggested there was nothing to stop the discussion being included within the public minutes of the meeting.

Recording of votes on the item was also considered and it was agreed a note of any Member dissenting could be recorded, should they wish it to be, which was agreed as an appropriate way forward.

18. **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.

19. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

- a) The non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 14 October 2021 were agreed.

- b) The non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 15th September 2021 were noted.
- c) The non-public draft minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 20 October 2021 were noted.
- d) The draft non-public minutes of the Hospitality Working Party meeting held on 23 September 2021 were noted.

20. **BARBICAN RENEWAL**

The Committee considered and approved a joint report of the City Surveyor and Managing Director of the Barbican Centre updating on work relating to the Barbican Renewal programme.

21. **IMPLEMENTING THE OUTCOMES OF THE CHARITY REVIEW AND STRENGTHENING THE COORDINATION OF PHILANTHROPIC GIVING ACROSS THE CITY CORPORATION**

The Committee considered and approved a report of the Managing Director of Bridge House Estates & Chief Charities Officer providing Members with an update on the current Corporate Charities Review.

22. **SECURE CITY PROGRAMME (SCP) - VIDEO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

The Committee considered and approved a joint report of the Commissioner and Executive Director of Environment updating on the Secure City Programme Video Management System.

23. **WATER CHARGE REFUNDS FOR SECURE TENANTS**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services relating to the collection of water charges from its Secure Tenants under an arrangement with Thames Water.

During discussion, the following points were raised:-

- The Housing Revenue Account was a statutory ringfenced account, into which no other monies from Local Authority funds could be transferred. The City Corporation's Housing Revenue Account was considered to be in a challenging financial position and any decision as to the level of payments to be made would need to be mindful of the impact on the fund.
- Several Members stressed that the decision reached on this item by the Community and Children's Services Committee had not been taken lightly. Any decision to take a different approach now would need to be considered carefully and be fully informed, with implications understood.
- A Member highlighted potential reputational issues to the City Corporation associated with any decision.
- Reference was made to a forthcoming review relating to Housing Revenue Accounts with it suggested that it would be prudent to wait for this update to be considered alongside the issue of water charges, so as to allow

Members to take an informed decision as to the affordability of any approach.

It was agreed that officers should be requested to bring back a further report once the Housing Revenue Account review update had been received, which would then allow Members to deal with the issue in a position of full knowledge. The Deputy Chairman's proposal received the agreement of the Committee, with Marianne Fredericks abstaining from the decision.

RESOLVED: That Members agree to a further report being presented to allow them to consider fully the position of the Housing Revenue Account alongside consideration of any potential Water Charge refunds.

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

Suicide Prevention

A Member raised the issue of suicide prevention and stressed the importance of maintaining momentum in this area of work, notwithstanding various organisational and structural changes in recent times. The Chief Operating Officer confirmed that she was now leading on this important issue.

Afghan Resettlement

A Member raised their concern with the ongoing efforts in support of the Afghan Citizen resettlement. The Member highlighted a desperate need for warm clothes as the cold weather was approaching and suggested the City Corporation look at what additional support it could offer. Members acknowledged this was an important issue and proposed it be considered further outside of the meeting.

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

Funding for Centre of Finance, Innovation & Technology

The Director of Innovation & Growth updated Members on issues relating to funding of a Centre of Finance, Innovation & Technology.

26. CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

The confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 14 October were agreed.

27. THE PLATINUM JUBILEE

The Committee considered confidential report of the Remembrancer relating to the Platinum Jubilee.

28. TARGET OPERATING MODEL - ORGANISATIONAL DESIGN DEPUTY TOWN CLERK

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Town Clerk setting out a Target Operating Model Organisational Design.

The meeting ended at 4.33pm.

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Christopher Rumbles
christopher.rumbles@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Friday, 19 November 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Friday, 19 November 2021 at 2.00 pm

Present

Members:

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair) | Christopher Hayward |
| Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman) | Shravan Joshi |
| Deputy Keith Bottomley | Jeremy Mayhew |
| Anne Fairweather | Deputy Tom Sleigh |
| Tracey Graham | |

In Attendance Virtually

Tijs Broeke
Deputy James Thomson

Officers:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Caroline Al-Beyerty | - Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer |
| Paul Double | - City Remembrancer |
| Gregory Moore | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Dianne Merrifield | - Chamberlain's Department |
| Paul Wilkinson | - City Surveyor |
| Emma Moore | - Chief Operating Officer |
| Sonia Virdee | - Chamberlain's Department |
| James Lee | - Central Grants Unit |
| Peter Young | - Corporate Property Group Director |
| Mark Jarvis | - Head of Finance |
| Sanjay Odedra | - Head of Media (Financial Services) |
| Leanne Murphy | - Town Clerk's Department |

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Tijs Broeke, Sir Michael Snyder, Karina Dostalova and Alderman Sir David Wootton.

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

There were none.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the public minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2021 be approved as an accurate record.

Matters arising

A Member raised a point of order, asking why agenda Item 12 was not being considered in public session as the content did not appear to be commercially

sensitive. The Chair advised that it was deemed appropriate for this report to be discussed in non-public as the decision might impact on the Schools fees.

The Town Clerk confirmed that, legally, the application of the Local Government Act 1972 did not apply to the Independent Schools and CoLAT so was not subject to the rules around transparency. As this was private business, it was deemed necessary to be considered in non-public session.

The following legal advice was also read by the Town Clerk for clarity:

The City of London Corporation is the proprietor of the Schools acting in its general corporate capacity, and their property is held as part of the City's Estate. The costs attributable to the running of the Schools are met from parents' fees and are otherwise funded from the City Corporation's own funds, City's Cash. The City Corporation is not acting in its capacity as a local authority as proprietor of any of the three independent Schools, which are classified under the Education Acts as being within the Independent sector.

The provisions of Part VA and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (Public Access to Meetings and Documents) do not apply to business of committees of the Court of Common Council in discharging the City Corporation's functions as proprietor of the three Schools. These statutory provisions only apply to the City Corporation in the discharge of its functions as a local authority and a police authority.

It was noted that the application of the Local Government Act was defined by whether a Committee was funded by City's Cash and City Fund. This distinction was often clear, but some committees had mixed functions and therefore subject to mixed funding. The Town Clerk confirmed that the City Corporation had discretion to apply or disapply conditions of Act, and whilst agendas could be split based on where these fit, the Policy & Resources Committee considered this matter in 2013 and 2016 and rejected this approach. Members acknowledged this would be complicated but felt it might be timely to reconsider this approach.

Members discussed whether those participating virtually should be allowed to participate in the non-public discussions. Due to the size of the Sub-Committee, the Chair agreed for those Members joining virtually to be able to speak but not vote on this occasion.

4. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND - APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chief Grants Officer and Director of City Bridge Trust regarding applications for the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF).

RESOLVED, that Members:-

- Note the approved and rejected grants under delegated authority at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in October 2021 (Appendix 1);
- Approve the grant recommended to 'New Diorama' at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in October 2021 (Appendix 2);
- Note the current position of the CILNF with respect to funds available and upcoming reporting.

5. CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chamberlain providing a Capital Funding Update.

RESOLVED, that Members:-

- Agree to apply the 'one-in, one-out' approach to reallocate £30k from savings on the PRSCMS project to provide top-up funding to take the Barbican Renewal project through to the end of 2021/22;
- Review the schemes summarised in Table 1 and, particularly in the context of the current financial climate, to confirm their continued essential priority for release of funding at this time; and accordingly;
- Agree the release of up to £2.648m for the schemes in Table 1 from the reserves of City Fund and City's Cash as appropriate, subject to the required gateway approvals;
- Note that in order to maintain sound financial discipline a review of unallocated central project funding provisions will be brought to Members following discussions taking place at the bi-lateral meetings in January 2022

6. CAPITAL FUNDING - PRIORITISATION OF 2022/23 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS - INITIAL REVIEW

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding an initial review Capital Funding Prioritisation of 2022/23 Annual Capital Bids.

Members were informed that Senior Officers had debated and prioritised the bids into a traffic light system of Green (demonstrates the essential criteria), Amber (essential criteria less clear) and Red (does not demonstrate essential criteria/not essential to do now). The list had already been challenged by the Chair and Deputy Chairman who made some adjustments.

Members considered the proposed Green/Amber/Red Bids and approved them all. The following comments were made on individual bids on the Amber and Red lists:

- **Barbican Centre - Repairs to roof, expansion joint repairs and drainage and water systems** – it was felt a holistic approach to all works at the Centre, including the podium and the Renewal Project, was

needed. Members were happy for Officers to take additional time to explore this.

- **DCCS - Library Management System** – it was hoped a plan would be developed to maximise a single management system.
- **Walbrook Wharf Feasibility Study - 2027 & beyond** – this project was considered too premature to be Green. The Corporate Property Group Director felt it was deceptive to refer to the project post-2027 as Officers hoped to be ready with planning consent, a waste management system decision and aspiration to introduce rivers by 2027 at the latest. A plea was made to the Sub-Committee for some funding to be made available to move the project forward.

The Deputy Chairman, after having discussions with the Chair for CASC, thought it unlikely to incur increased costs if the project was delayed for a year, and Members were content provided it was Green by next year.

In response to queries, it was confirmed this was to undertake sufficient research next year into waste management and explore river freight potential along with surveys which required strategic direction to be agreed in light of ongoing maintenance and repairs to the current depot and net zero targets by 2027. Officers agreed to come back to the Sub-Committee with a revised and lower bid.

- **IT - Data Repository/Warehouse** – a Member noted the complexity of the subject and felt it would be helpful to invite Officers involved in individual projects to provide the Sub-Committee with relevant information, as often Members were only aware of issues and implications if the project fell within their own committee areas.

An Officer confirmed IT issues had been included within the TOM process and focus was given to what has to happen rather than what would be nice to happen. Officers agree to invite Chief Officers to the meeting considering Amber and Red projects.

- **Guildhall Complex Post Covid New Ways of Working - Stage 2 works and furniture** – Members acknowledged the difficulties as it was not yet clear where to aim. Officers confirmed the project had begun looking and the future of North and West wings of Guildhall, and clear direction on the shape of the project was still needed.
- **St Paul's Gyrotory** – the Chair read comments received in advance of the meeting from a Member who asked if a) Officers could split out the different elements of the Gyrotory project to get clarity on what costs and timeline for realisation is of each element; b) endorsement of the recommendation that a “minimal allocation to fund investigations to inform the central funding requirement” is approved to be signed off under delegated authority to ensure the process progresses whilst not yet moving into Green for 2022/23, and c) instruct Officers to engage

with developers of 81 Newgate Street and other local projects to get clearer understanding of the level of their financial contributions to improvements to the public realm. Members and Officers were supportive of the suggestions and approved the delegated authority.

- **St Paul's Cathedral Re-Lighting** – a Member noted that there were a number of upcoming important anniversaries plus other events with St Paul's at the heart of national events. Currently, half of the dome was not lit and there were general health and safety concerns. The Member asked if this could be considered as a Capital Bid, subject to necessary conditions, e.g. that it be made clear the revenue costs for lighting be borne from revenue at the Cathedral.

The Chair declared an interest in St Paul's noting that she sat on the Cathedral's Council.

Members discussed the informal agreement and questioned what the City Corporation's responsibilities were, the S106 obligations and why the Cathedral were not financing the costs as it was not a Corporation owned building and the Cathedral had its own funding stream. It was also noted that there were other funding options available including bids to the National Lottery Heritage Fund.

A Member advised that St Paul's had struggled during lockdown and was only back to 40% of donations experienced pre-pandemic. The Member also noted that the Corporation received a secondary income from people visiting the Cathedral.

Members were concerned by the vagueness of the agreement and the potential for the Corporation taking on responsibility for something that was not theirs. Whilst this was regarded as a good cause, Members felt that the project provided a luxury item for St Paul's and was not considered to be a sufficient responsibility to the City Corporation. Members requested more clarity, including the process for the potential S106 agreement and whether this should come from City's Fund when this was a private property, and were happy to put the bid on hold until this was provided.

It was agreed a fully thought-out plan with conditions was needed and Members agreed to give delegated authority to progress this work pending further information. Officers agreed to provide a report providing more detail and place the bid in a separate waiting room.

- **IT tech bids** - A Member observed that all tech funding bids were not capital bids. Officers confirmed this was an ongoing issue with IT being addressed by the TOM and required more investigative working. This would be changed later.
- **Hampstead Heath Pergola Oak Structures repair and replacement** – Members were informed that there were opportunities for fundraising at

this high-profile site and lots more that could be done including weddings. A Member requested that funding opportunities be revisited and that the City Corporation do more to support all fundraising opportunities and outreach.

RESOLVED, that Members: -

- Note the total value of City Fund and City's Cash bids amounting to £61.9m against a target upper limit of £30m (excl BHE);
- Review the initial RAG rating of £24.3m green, £29.3m amber and £8.4m red contained in the appendices (determined in consultation with senior officers);
- Agree that, subject to Member feedback, funding for the green bids be incorporated into the medium-term financial plans, providing they remain within the £30m overall limits for City Fund and City's Cash and remain at a similar modest level for Bridge House;
- Agree in principle that bids with a final RAG rating of amber and red be deferred;
- Agree that amber-rated bids be placed on a reserve list to be progressed in the event that funding headroom is identified;
- Note that the final decision on the green-rated bids for inclusion in the 2022/23 draft budgets will be confirmed at the joint meeting of RASC and the service committee and Bridge House Estates Board chairmen in January 2022;
- Agree that a minimal allocation to fund investigations to inform the central funding requirement for the St Paul's Gyratory is approved under delegated authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to ensure the process continues to progress;
- Agree that delegated authority be given to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to allow Officers to progress with work concerning St Paul's Cathedral Re-Lighting and explore options in more detail to present to Members whilst the bid is placed in a separate "waiting room".

7. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN BETWEEN MEETINGS

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Town Clerk concerning action taken between meetings.

RESOLVED, that the report be noted.

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

There were no questions.

9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
The Chair gave thanks to Karina Dostalova who stepped down as a Member of the Court of Common Council, and subsequently the Sub-Committee, after the publication of the agenda.
10. **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.
11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 17 September 2021 were agreed as a correct record.
12. **ALLOCATION OF THREE INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS FUNDING WITHIN THE SCHOOLS FUNDING MODEL**
The Sub-Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Community & Children's Services and the Chamberlain regarding the Allocation of Three Independent Schools Funding within the Schools Funding Model.
13. **NON-PUBLIC REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN BETWEEN MEETINGS**
The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk regarding non-public action taken between meetings.
14. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no non-public questions.
15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no urgent items of non-public business.

The meeting ended at 3.42 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Leanne Murphy
Leanne.murphy@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

PROJECTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 17 November 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| Deputy Keith Bottomley (Chairman) | Andrew McMurtrie |
| Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman) | Susan Pearson |
| Rehana Ameer | James de Sausmarez |
| Randall Anderson | Deputy Philip Woodhouse |

Officers:

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Joseph Anstee | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Peter Lisley | - Assistant Town Clerk |
| Emma Moore | - Chief Operating Officer |
| Rohit Paul | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Sarah Baker | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Genine Whitehorne | - Town Clerk's Department |
| Sonia Virdee | - Chamberlain's Department |
| Dianne Merrifield | - Chamberlain's Department |
| Sam Collins | - Chamberlain's Department |
| Christopher Bell | - City of London Police |
| Sarah Williams | - City of London Police |
| Gary Brailsford-Hart | - City of London Police |
| Paul Murtagh | - Community & Children's Services Department |
| James Illsley | - Community & Children's Services Department |
| Simon Cribbens | - Community & Children's Services Department |
| Mohamed Hussain | - Community & Children's Services Department |
| Jason Hayes | - Community & Children's Services Department |
| Ola Obadara | - City Surveyor's Department |
| Brendan Crowley | - City Surveyor's Department |
| Mark Donaldson | - City Surveyor's Department |
| Ian Hughes | - Environment Department |
| Ruth Kocher | - Environment Department |
| Tim Munday | - Environment Department |
| Madhur Gurjar | - Open Spaces Department |

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Christopher Hayward and Deputy Catherine McGuinness.

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

Susan Pearson declared a pecuniary interest in Item 6 – Windows Programme & Common Parts Redecoration – Golden Lane Estate by virtue of being a resident on Golden Lane. Susan Pearson advised that she had a dispensation to speak, but not vote, on matters relating to housing.

3. **GATEWAY APPROVAL PROCESS**

RESOLVED – That the Gateway Approval Process be received.

4. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 20 October 2021 are approved as an accurate record.

5. **PUBLIC ACTIONS**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Town Clerk regarding public actions and noted the updates in respect of outstanding items.

RESOLVED - That the public actions list be received.

6. **GATEWAY 3 ISSUE - WINDOWS PROGRAMME & COMMON PARTS REDECORATION - GOLDEN LANE ESTATE**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3 Issue report of the Director of Community and Children's Services regarding the windows and common parts redecoration programmes at Golden Lane Estate. The Director of Community and Children's Services introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points, and the Sub Committee noted the change of scope.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the Chamberlain confirmed that the project funding had been secured via multiple capital funding bids but was all in place. The Director of Community and Children's Services advised that a number of the costings were based on early estimates and would be updated before Gateway 4 approval was sought.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee agree:

- (a) That additional budget of £95,000 is approved for the change of scope to include replacement roof design work to reach the next Gateway;
- (b) Note the revised project budget of £1,026,150 (excluding risk);
- (c) Note the total estimated cost of the project at £10,893,696 (excluding risk);
- (d) That Option 3 is approved to restructure the project into separate work streams (to progress through the remainder of the Gateway process independently) and to revise the project scope to include roof renewals; and

- (e) That approval is granted to rename the project 'Windows Programme, Common Parts Redecorations & Roofing Renewals – Golden Lane Estate' in light of the requested scope change.

7. GATEWAY 6 - CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 6 report of the Chief Operating Officer in respect of the Customer Relationship Management (CRM) project. The Chief Operating Officer introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points. In response to a question from the Chairman, the Chamberlain advised that the project's business benefits had been realised.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee note the content of the report and approve the closure of this project.

8. GATEWAY 5 - WEST HAM PARK PLAYGROUND REFURBISHMENT

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 5 report of the Director of Open Spaces regarding the refurbishment of West Ham Park playground. The Director of Open Spaces introduced the report before the Chamberlain confirmed that all project funding was in place. The Director of Open Spaces agreed to circulate the design brochure to the Sub Committee following the meeting to inform Members of the intended outcome of the refurbishment.

In response to a question from a Member regarding security, the Director of Open Spaces confirmed that the playground was secured by gated fencing, and that all fencing would be retained following the project. Further to this, West Ham Park itself was also secured by gated fencing, with fixed opening hours.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee:

1. Approve the main construction works contract sum budget of £724,905 (excluding risk);
2. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £880,519 (excluding risk but including the £5000 previously released CRP); This includes the cost of the bespoke play elements as approved by the previous GW5 report and the main construction implementation works as noted above;
3. Note and approve revised costed risk provision of £127,000; and
4. That the previously approved Costed Risk Provision of £5,000 towards staff costs be retained.

9. GATEWAY 2 ISSUE - ENERGY REDUCTION PROGRAMME – PHASE 1

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2 Issue report of the City Surveyor regarding Phase 1 of the Energy Reduction Programme. The City Surveyor introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points, also outlining the proposed changes in scope for the programme, with some constituent parts now being progressed as part of the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme. The City Surveyor then explained the recommendations with regards to the reallocation of project funding. The Sub

Committee noted that the reallocations had been endorsed by the Chamberlain but would require the approval of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee.

In response to a question from a Member, the City Surveyor advised that a Carbon Offset policy had been agreed which set out the use of funding and cost savings. The Chairman added that there were specific plans in respect of energy savings set out in the Climate Action Strategy. The Deputy Chairman advised of his endorsement of the report's recommendations, which were central to the Climate Action Strategy, before praising the work done by the City of London Corporation so far in this area, and the benefits of the grant funding available from central government. The Sub Committee noted that there were further Member briefings in December 2021 and January 2022, which would provide more information on funding and the programme processes.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee agree:

1. That Option 3 is approved for:
 - a) Change in scope to limit the project to the three sub-projects, for LED Lighting at: Central Criminal Court, Smithfield Car Park and Tower Hill Coach and Car Park. These to be received for further approval as separate gateway papers (as set out above under 'Next Gateway'). Note the total estimated project cost including risk is £574,288 for completion in 2022/23;
 - b) Increase of allocated S106 Carbon Offset funding from £247k to £304k which will be wholly used to fund the LED lighting and the Central Criminal Court;
 - c) Reallocation of £229,200 of unrequired provisional funding allocation to the 'BEMS Upgrade Project-CPG Estate – Phase 1' to support energy reduction for the Guildhall.
 - d) Withdraw provisional funding allocation of £245,610 which is no longer required for this project;
2. Cancellation of the project titled 'Guildhall Complex Walbrook Wharf Sub-metering' (Project Number: 55800048) which was superseded by the above named 'GHC Sub-Metering' and is now being delivered through the PSDS project.

10. **GATEWAY 2 ISSUE - BEMS UPGRADE PROJECT-CPG ESTATE – PHASE 1**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2 Issue report of the City Surveyor regarding Phase 1 of the BEMS Upgrade project across the Corporate Property Group estate. The City Surveyor introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the proposals, adding that the increase in project costs was due to the enabling works required, particularly in respect of IT infrastructure. In response to a question from the Chairman, the Chamberlain confirmed that the project funding was in place, with some funding to be reallocated to the project

from the Energy Reduction Programme, as agreed as part of the previous item, pending the approval of Resource Allocation Sub Committee.

In response to a question from a Member, the City Surveyor advised that the budget increases would not affect the overall programme, with other buildings in the corporate estate to be addressed in Phase 2 of the project.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee agree:

1. That Option 3 is approved:
 - a) Approval for reallocation of £229,200 of the now unrequired central funding (£114,600 City Fund and £114,600 City's Cash) from 'Energy Reduction Programme – Phase 1' to the 'BEMS Upgrade Project-CPG Estate – Phase 1 (stage 2)';
 - b) Approve that the CWP funds within the project 'C1522CW002L' are used to meet the costs of the Guildhall East wing control upgrades within the BEMS Upgrade Project-CPG Estate – Phase 1(stage 2); and
 - c) Approve that the CWP funds within the project 'R0722CW003L' are used to meet the costs of the LMA controls upgrades within the BEMS Upgrade Project-CPG Estate – Phase 1(stage 2).

11. GATEWAY 3 - WANSTEAD PARK PONDS PROJECT

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3 report of the Executive Director of Environment regarding the Wanstead Park Ponds. The Chairman advised that the project would be funded by a mix of City's Cash and external funding. In response to a question from the Chairman, the Executive Director of Environment advised that there may be minor revenue implications for water recharging, adding that this would be clearer at Gateway 4.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee agree:

1. That the underspend of £30 000 from the Engineering Fees is reallocated to carry out further engineering consultancy;
2. That additional budget of £51 000 is approved to reach the next Gateway;
3. Note the revised project budget of £241 000 (excluding risk);
4. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £500 000 - £1 million (excluding risk and possible external funding); and
5. That Options 2 and 3, revisor safety works and water balance interventions are approved for progression to detailed options appraisal stage.

12. **GATEWAY 2 - TOWER HILL PLAY AREA REFURBISHMENT**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2 report regarding the refurbishment of the Tower Hill play area.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee agree:

1. That budget of £16,000 is approved for staff costs and fees and charges, to reach the next Gateway;
2. Note the project budget of £16,000 (excluding risk);
3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at £195,000(including risk); and
4. That a Costed Risk Provision of £16,500 is approved (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer).

13. **GATEWAY 6 - COMMITTEE ROOMS AUDIO VISUAL EQUIPMENT**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 6 report of the Chief Operating Officer regarding the Committee Rooms Audio Visual Equipment. A Member queried why the Livery Hall was not included within the project, as the equivalent facility was now being provided on a per meeting basis, which was not cost effective. The Chief Operating Officer responded that the project originated before the Covid-19 pandemic, and as requirements were different at that time, the Livery Hall and other spaces were not included in the scope of the project. Members asked that this be assessed, with a view to progression as a separate project.

Members commented that the results could be shared as an effective promotion of new ways of working. The Deputy Chairman added that the facilities available had enabled the Committee Rooms to provide a Control Room during the Lord Mayor's Show, which had been significantly beneficial and a noticeable improvement on previous years.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee note the content of the report and approve the closure of this project.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

16. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

| Item No. | Paragraph No |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| 17 - 19 | 3 |
| 20 | 2,3,5 |
| 21 - 24 | 3 |
| 25 - 26 | 7 |
| 27 - 30 | 3 |
| 31 - 32 | - |

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.
18. **NON-PUBLIC ACTIONS**
The Sub Committee received a list of non-public outstanding actions.
19. **PROPERTY PROJECTS GROUP (PPG) CONSTRUCTION MARKET UPDATE**
The Sub Committee received an oral update from the Property Projects Group (PPG) Director.
20. **GATEWAY 6 - ACTION KNOW FRAUD**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 6 report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police.
21. **GATEWAY 5 ISSUE - GREAT ARTHUR HOUSE NEW FLATS**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 5 Issue report of the Director of Community and Children’s Services.
22. **GATEWAY 4 ISSUE - HIGH SUPPORT HOSTEL SITE DEVELOPMENT**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 4 Issue report of the Director of Community and Children’s Services.
23. **GATEWAY 5 ISSUE - TENANTS' ELECTRICAL SERVICES TESTING AND SMOKE DETECTOR INSTALLATION - PHASE 5**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 5 Issue report of the Director of Community and Children’s Services.
24. **GATEWAY 1-5 - COLP POWERBI PHASE 1**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 1-5 report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police.
25. **GATEWAY 1-5 - END DEVICE USER REFRESH**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 1-5 report of the Chamberlain.
26. **GATEWAY 5 - SECURE CITY PROGRAMME (SCP) - VIDEO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (VMS)**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 5 report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police and the Executive Director of Environment.

27. **DELEGATED AUTHORITY REQUEST - CITY JUNIOR SCHOOL EXPANSION TO SATELLITE SITE**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor.
28. **DELEGATED AUTHORITY REQUEST - REFURBISHMENT OF TOWER CHAMBERS, 74 MOORGATE, EC2 - BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor.
29. **PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW**
The Sub Committee received a report of the Town Clerk.
- a) **Red Report: Central Criminal Courts, Fire Alarm Replacements and Associated Public Address System**
The Sub Committee received a red report of the City Surveyor.
- b) **Red Report: Sydenham Hill Redevelopment, Lewisham, SE26 6ND**
The Sub Committee received a red report of the City Surveyor.
- c) **Red Report: Housing Management System Upgrade**
The Sub Committee received a red report of the Director of Community and Children's Services.
30. **REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**
The Sub Committee received a report of the Town Clerk.
31. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
32. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no items of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 3.38 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Joseph Anstee
joseph.anstee@cityoflondon.gov.uk

| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Committee(s) Policy and Resources Committee | Date: 16 December 2021 |
| Subject: Act of Common Council – Nationality Requirement for Aldermen and Presiding Officer at Wardmote | Public |
| Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly? | N/A |
| Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending? | No |
| Report of: Comptroller and City Solicitor and Town Clerk and Chief Executive | For Decision |
| Report author: Edward Wood, Chief Solicitor | |

Summary

The accompanying Bill is intended to clarify the nationality requirement for Aldermen by removing the erroneous reference in Acts of Common Council suggesting that there is a pre-existing requirement for Aldermen to be British subjects. The Bill is also intended to introduce more flexibility into the arrangements for presiding at a wardmote by allowing a Lord Mayor’s Aldermanic Representative to preside where none of the traditional presiding officers are available.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Consider whether to approve the Bill at Appendix 1 and submit it to the Court of Common Council for the necessary readings.

Main Report

Nationality Requirement for Aldermen

1. Members will recall that the nationality requirement for Aldermen was recently clarified in a Law Officers’ Opinion. The current version of the Wardmote Book has been updated to make it clear that an Alderman may be a Commonwealth citizen or a citizen of the Republic of Ireland. This restriction arises from section 3 of the Act of Settlement of 1701, as modified by Schedule 7 of the British Nationality Act 1981, and is not therefore a requirement that the Court of Common Council can remove. There is no additional requirement in the Act of Common Council of 15 April 1714 that Aldermen must be British subjects, and this

retrospective interpretation in Acts of Common Council from 1998 onwards was probably based on the separate requirement to be a freeman. The freedom was originally limited to British subjects but was opened up to European Union citizens from 1996 and to persons of any nationality from 1999.

2. The meaning of the term British subject has itself changed over time, with references in legislation passed before the commencement of the British Nationality Act 1981 being synonymous with a Commonwealth citizen, and later references relating only to a small residual class of individuals. Whilst the reference in Acts of Common Council from 1998 onwards to a pre-existing requirement for Aldermen to be British subjects has no legal effect, this has understandably caused some confusion and your Committee has asked for the position to be put beyond doubt through a new Act of Common Council. Clause 2 of the Bill (at Appendix 1) seeks to do this by removing the reference to British subjects from the Act of Common Council of 10 September 1998 (at Appendix 2).

Presiding Officer at Wardmote

3. Traditionally, at an Aldermanic election, the Lord Mayor, or in their absence their locum tenens, acts as presiding officer. At an election of Common Councilmen, the Alderman of the ward, or in their absence the Lord Mayor or their locum tenens, acts as presiding officer at the wardmote, and the Deputy of a ward can also preside at a wardmote to fill a casual vacancy. When Members recently reviewed the Wardmote Book, they asked officers to look at these arrangements, to see if more flexibility could be introduced.
4. One issue is that there are many duties that the Lord Mayor is asked to undertake, both at home and abroad, and the number of senior Aldermen who have served as Lord Mayor and can act as locum tenens is quite limited. In any event it is not possible for the Lord Mayor and their locum tenens, or more than one locum tenens, to be present in the City at the same time and this limits the number of substitutions that can be put in place on the same day. Whilst section 17(3) of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1954 enables a poll to be delayed to a different date in some circumstances, to allow the Lord Mayor to preside in multiple wards, it would be better in many cases to avoid any delay in the holding of a poll, for example where the ordinary ward elections in relation to the whole number of Common Councilmen are scheduled to be held on the same day.
5. Another concern that has been expressed by some Members is around potential conflicts when acting in the presiding officer role, for example where an Alderman has supported a particular candidate for Common Councilman at the election in question. In this context it is important to note that, under section 2 of the City of London Ballot Act 1887, the presiding officer at an election where a poll is held is also the returning officer for that election, with all of the powers and duties which are conferred and imposed on that position. Whilst the link between an Alderman and their ward is very important, and in most cases such engagement will not give rise to an actual conflict or perception of bias, there is clearly a desire amongst some Aldermen to have increased flexibility to recuse themselves in some circumstances, for example through an exchange of duties with an Alderman in another ward.

6. It is known that occasionally the customary arrangements set out above have been departed from in the past, out of necessity, but it is felt that any deviation ought to be formalised and regularised. The initial proposal from Members was that a Representative Lord Mayor could be authorised to preside at ward elections. However, this must still be an Alderman who has passed the chair and so would not address all of the above concerns. Allowing any Alderman to preside in a different ward would maximise the available options, but it is proposed that such arrangements should continue to be exercised under the authority of the Lord Mayor, through the appointment in writing of a Lord Mayor's Aldermanic Representative to act as presiding officer at a specific election. It may be worth emphasising that is not intended to routinely depart from the current arrangements – the option of a Lord Mayor's Aldermanic Representative would be used where none of the traditional presiding officers were available, and this is reflected in the drafting of clauses 3 and 4 in the Bill.

Next Steps

7. If Members wish to take the Bill forward then, in accordance with Standing Order 46, it will be submitted to the Recorder of London for settling. The proposal is that it will be read a first and second time at the Court of Common Council on 13 January 2022 and read a third time and made an Act of Common Council at the subsequent meeting on 10 March 2022. It will then be in force in time for the resumption of ward elections later that month.

Conclusion

8. The accompanying Bill has been drafted at the behest of Members, to clarify the nationality requirement for Aldermen and to introduce greater flexibility into the arrangements for presiding at a wardmote. If your Committee is content with the draft document then it will be submitted to the Court of Common Council for approval. If made and passed as an Act of Common Council, it will be in force for the 'all out' elections of Common Councilmen on 23 March 2022 and for the resumption of Aldermanic by-elections.

Contact:

Edward Wood
Chief Solicitor
020 7332 1834
edward.wood@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Bill for an Act of Common Council

Appendix 2

Act of Common Council of 10 September 1998 (as amended)

This page is intentionally left blank

]To be considered at the Court of Common Council

2021

A BILL

For an Act of Common Council to –

Clarify the nationality requirements for Aldermen and to make new arrangements for the presiding officer at a wardmote.

WHEREAS:-

- (1) From time immemorial there has existed and still exists in the City of London (“the City”) a Common Council consisting of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons in Common Council assembled and the Common Council have made, passed, ordained and established divers Acts, Ordinances, Rules, Orders and Regulations for the regulation and good government of the City and its Liberties as to them from time to time has been found necessary and expedient;
- (2) Acts of Common Council from 1998 onwards cite an Act of Common Council made and passed on the 15th day of April 1714 as providing that candidates for the office of Alderman must be British subjects, but the Law Officers have advised that this is not in fact the case;
- (3) The reference was probably based on the separate requirement to be a Freeman of the City, which was originally limited to British subjects but was opened up to European Union citizens from 1996 and to persons of any nationality from 1999;
- (4) The meaning of the term “British subject” has itself changed over time, with references in legislation passed before the commencement of the British Nationality Act 1981 being synonymous with a Commonwealth citizen, and later references relating only to a small residual class of individuals;
- (5) Section 3 of the Act of Settlement 1701, as modified by Schedule 7 of the British Nationality Act 1981, prevents any person who is not a Commonwealth citizen or a citizen of the Republic of Ireland from assuming the office of Alderman;
- (6) The reference in Acts of Common Council from 1998 onwards to Aldermen having to be British subjects accordingly has no effect but has caused some confusion on the Court of Common Council and more generally;
- (7) At the election of an Alderman the Lord Mayor, or in their absence their locum tenens, acts as presiding officer at the wardmote;
- (8) At the election of a Common Councilman, or Common Councilmen as the case may be, the Alderman of the ward, or in their absence the Lord Mayor or their locum tenens, acts as presiding officer at the wardmote, and the Deputy of a ward can also preside at a wardmote to fill a casual vacancy;

- (9) Under section 2 of the City of London Ballot Act 1887 the presiding officer at an election where a poll is held is also the returning officer for that election, with all of the powers and duties which are conferred and imposed on that position;
- (10) A number of Aldermen have expressed concerns about acting as presiding officer where they have supported a particular candidate for Common Councilman within their own ward;
- (11) It is not possible for the Lord Mayor and their locum tenens, or more than one locum tenens, to be present in the City at the same time and in addition the number of senior Aldermen who can act as Lord Mayor locum tenens is at present fairly limited and is likely to diminish further in the next few years;
- (12) Where by reason of the illness, absence or other incapacity of any Alderman the Lord Mayor is required to take a poll in more than one ward on the same day, each such poll shall be taken on such a day as the Lord Mayor may appoint, in accordance with section 17(3) of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1954, but it would be beneficial to avoid any delay in the holding of a poll, especially where the ordinary ward elections in relation to the whole number of Common Councilmen are scheduled to be held on the same day;
- (13) His late Majesty King Edward the Third by his Charter made and granted to the City in the fifteenth year of his reign afterwards confirmed and ratified by Parliament did (amongst other things) grant that if any customs in the City before that time obtained and used were in any part hard or defective or any things in the City newly arising in which no remedy had been ordained should need amendment the Mayor and Aldermen of the City and their successors with the assent of the Commonalty of the City might put and ordain thereto fit remedy as often as it should seem expedient to them so that such ordinance should be profitable to the King and to the citizens and to all other liege subjects resorting to the City and agreeable also to reason and good faith.

BE IT THEREFORE and IT IS HEREBY ENACTED ORDAINED AND ESTABLISHED by the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, the Right Worshipful the Aldermen and the Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled and the authority of the same **AS FOLLOWS:**

Interpretation

1. In this Act –

“Act of 1998” means an Act of Common Council made and passed on the 10th day of September 1998;

“Act of 2013” means an Act of Common Council made and passed on the 16th day of May 2013;

“casual vacancy” means a vacancy in the office of Common Councilman arising from the death, disqualification or resignation of the incumbent;

“Lord Mayor’s Aldermanic Representative” means any Alderman appointed in writing by the Lord Mayor to act as presiding officer at the election in question.

Candidature for the Office of Alderman

2. In section 3(1) of the Act of 1998, as substituted by section 2 of the Act of 2013, the words “British subjects,” shall be omitted.

Presiding Officer at the Election of an Alderman

3. At the election of an Alderman a Lord Mayor’s Aldermanic Representative may act as presiding officer at the wardmote in the absence of the Lord Mayor and their locum tenens.

Presiding Officer at the Election of a Common Councilman or Common Councilmen

4. At the election of a Common Councilman or Common Councilmen a Lord Mayor’s Aldermanic Representative may act as presiding officer at the wardmote in the absence of the Alderman of the ward, the Lord Mayor and their locum tenens, and also in the absence of the Deputy of the ward in the case of an election to fill a casual vacancy.

Commencement

5. The provisions of this Act shall come into force on the day on which it is made and passed as an Act of Common Council.

Savings

6. Save as hereby varied the provisions of the Act of 1998 and the Act of 2013 shall continue in full force and effect.

This page is intentionally left blank



NICHOLS

Mayor

A Common Council holden in the Guildhall of the City of London on Thursday, the 10th September, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine hundred and Ninety-eight, and in the 47th year of the reign of Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Her other Realms and Territories, Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith, before the Right Honourable Lord Mayor, Sir Richard Nichols, Sir Peter Gadsden, GBE, AC, MA, DSc, FEng, Sir Christopher Leaver, GBE, DMus, Sir David Rowe-Ham, GBE, DLitt, Sir Alexander Graham, GBE, DCL, Sir Paul Newall, TD, DL, MA, DLitt, Sir Christopher Walford, MA, DCL, Sir Roger Cork, Lord Levene of Portsoken, KBE, Gavyn Farr Arther, MA, Clive Haydn Martin, OBE, TD, DL, Robert Gerard Finch, Esq, Peter Anthony Bull, Esq, Richard Devenish Agutter, Esq, Michael Berry Savory, Esq, David William Brewer, Esq, Frederick Michael Everard, Esq, CBE, BA, DSc, John Stephen Hughesdon, Esq, and David Howarth Seymour Howard, Esq, Alderman and one of the Sheriffs of the said City and the greater part of the Commons of the said City in the said Common Council then and there assembled.

An Act of Common Council to make further provision for the qualification of candidates for the office of Alderman of the City of London and amend further for such purpose an Act of Common Council made and passed on the 14th day of July 1960 relating to the election of Aldermen; provide for the approval of persons elected to that office; abolish fines and penalties upon Aldermen and disapply provisions of an Act of Common Council made on the 17th day of April 1812; provide for the governance of precedence or seniority of Aldermen and to amend an Act of Common Council made and passed on the 21st day of July 1932 relating to the nomination and election of Sheriffs of the City of London; and make further provision for vacancies among and the numbers of Common Councilmen.

WHEREAS from time immemorial there has existed and still exists in the City of London a Common Council consisting of the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the said City and certain Citizens being Freemen of the said City and called the Commons and the said Mayor, Aldermen and Commons in Common Council assembled have made, passed, ordained and established divers Acts, Ordinances, Rules, Orders and Regulations for the regulation and good government of the said City and its Liberties as to them from time to time has been found necessary and expedient;

And Whereas it is desirable to make changes to the Electoral Franchise of the said City by making it a qualification for Election to the office of Alderman that Candidates for that office would be justices of the peace (including Aldermen surrendering their Office who may intend to submit themselves for re-election for their Ward or otherwise for election as Aldermen) or persons suitable for appointment as justices of the peace for the City bench;

And Whereas Members of the Court of Lord Mayor and Aldermen have resolved that individual Aldermen should offer to surrender their Office as such on or before the expiry of a

term of six years (or any subsequent such term) albeit as respects any of them with the intention of submitting themselves for re-election or election otherwise as Aldermen as hereinbefore recited;

And Whereas by an Act of Common Council made and passed on the 14th day of July 1960 as amended by Acts of Common Council made and passed on the 9th day of February 1978 and the 17th day of May 1979 further provision was made governing the election of Aldermen of the City of London;

And Whereas it is necessary for the purposes hereinbefore recited to amend further the said Act made and passed on the 14th day of July 1960 and to insert provisions therein;

And Whereas it is consequential upon the said purposes and desirable that provision be made in relation to the approval of persons qualified to be elected to the office of Alderman and so elected;

And Whereas it is desirable to abolish fines and penalties upon Aldermen as having fallen into disuse and accordingly to disapply provisions of an Act of Common Council made on the 17th day of April 1812;

And Whereas it is desirable and in accordance with the purposes hereinbefore recited that provision be made in relation to the precedence or seniority of Aldermen and accordingly to amend an Act of Common Council made and passed on the 21st day of January 1932 relating to the Nomination and Election of Sheriffs of the City of London;

And Whereas it is desirable to make further provision for vacancies among and the numbers of Common Councilmen of the said City;

And Whereas His late Majesty King Edward the Third by his Charter made and granted to the said City in the fifteenth year of his reign afterwards confirmed and ratified by Parliament did (amongst other things) grant that if any customs in the said City before that time obtained and used were in any part hard or defective or any things in the said City newly arising in which no remedy has been ordained should need amendment the Mayor and Aldermen of the said City and their successors with the assent of the Commonalty of the said City might put and ordain thereunto fit remedy as often as it should seem expedient to them so that such ordinance should be profitable to the King and to the Citizens and to all other liege subjects resorting to the said City and agreeable also to reason and good faith;

Be it therefore enacted, and it is hereby enacted ordained and established by the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, the Right Worshipful the Aldermen and the Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled and by the authority of the same as follows:-

PART I – INTERPRETATION AND COMMENCEMENT

Interpretation

[1. In this Act –

“bankruptcy restrictions interim order” means a bankruptcy restrictions interim order under paragraph 5 of Schedule 4A to the Insolvency Act 1986 or any re-enactment thereof;

“bankruptcy restrictions order” means a bankruptcy restrictions order under paragraph 1 of Schedule 4A to the Insolvency Act 1986 or any re-enactment thereof;

“debt relief restrictions order” means a debt relief restrictions order under paragraph 1 of Schedule 4ZB to the Insolvency Act 1986 or any re-enactment thereof;

“debt relief restrictions undertaking” means a debt relief restrictions undertaking under paragraph 7 of Schedule 4ZB to the Insolvency Act 1986 or any re-enactment thereof;

“imprisonable offence” means an offence –

- (a) for which a person who has attained the age of 18 years may be sentenced to a term of imprisonment, or
- (b) for which, in the case of such a person, the sentence is fixed by law as life imprisonment;

“interim debt relief restrictions order” means an interim debt relief restrictions order under paragraph 5 of Schedule 4ZB to the Insolvency Act 1986 or any re-enactment thereof; and

“Town Clerk” shall have the meaning set out in section 4 (Amendment to Procedures for the Election of Aldermen, etc.).]¹

Commencement

- 2. This Act shall come into force on such date or dates as the Court of Common Council may by resolution determine and the said Court may determine different dates for different provisions of this Act.

PART II – ALDERMEN

Candidature for the Office of Alderman

- [3. (1) Without prejudice to the provisions of an Act of Common Council made on the fifteenth day of April 1714 (which provide that candidates for the office of Alderman must be of full age, British subjects, able and sufficient Citizens and Freemen of the City and not already Aldermen but are modified by subsection (6) below), such candidates shall at the time of their nomination and election satisfy the requirements of either subsection (2) or subsection (3) below, or both.
- (2) Candidates shall satisfy the requirements of this subsection if they are justices of the peace.
- (3) Candidates shall satisfy the requirements of this subsection if they –
 - (a) are not the subject of a debt relief restrictions order, an interim debt relief restrictions order, a bankruptcy restrictions order, a bankruptcy restrictions interim order or a debt relief restrictions undertaking, and

¹ Substituted by section 4 of the Act of Common Council of 16 May 2013

- (b) have not been convicted in the United Kingdom, the Channel Islands or the Isle of Man, of any imprisonable offence (whether or not sentenced to a term of imprisonment in respect of the offence).
- (4) Candidates shall, on the request of the Town Clerk, produce such evidence as is necessary to establish to his satisfaction that the condition stated in subsection (1) is met.
- (5) The Town Clerk may disclose for any purposes related to the nomination or election of a candidate for the office of Alderman whether he has seen evidence of the kind to which subsection (4) relates.
- (6) The Act of Common Council made on the fifteenth day of April 1714 referred to in subsection (1) shall apply to Aldermen to whom section 3A(1) of an Act of Common Council made on the 14th day of July 1960 (as amended) relates as if they were not already Aldermen.]²

Amendment to Procedures for the Election of Aldermen, etc

4. The Act of Common Council made and passed on the fourteenth day of July 1960 and entitled “An Act of Common Council to Repeal the Acts of Common Council made and passed on the 2nd day of December 1920 and the nineteenth day of September 1957 respectively; to amend the Act of Common Council made on the tenth day of October 1663; and to make further and better provision governing the election of Aldermen, Common Councilmen and Ward Beadles of the City of London” as amended by Acts of Common Council made and passed on the ninth day of February 1978 and the seventeenth day of May 1979 shall have effect subject to the following modifications –

(i) In Section 1 (Interpretation) there shall be inserted –

[...]³

“the Town Clerk” means the Town Clerk of the City of London from time to time.

(ii) After section 3 (Alderman – Report of death, resignation or disqualification) as substituted by [section 1]⁴ of the Act of Common Council, made and passed on the seventeenth day of May 1979 hereinbefore referred to, there shall be inserted –

“Provision as to Surrender of Office by Aldermen

3A. (1) An Alderman may offer to surrender his Office of Alderman in terms which also specify an intention by him to seek election at the wardmote for which section 4 of this Act provides.

(2) [...]⁵

(3) Subsection (2) shall not be taken into account in relation to the operation of sections 4 and 4A of this Act.”

² Substituted by section 2 of the Act of Common Council of 16 May 2013

³ Omitted by section 3 of the Act of Common Council of 16 May 2013

⁴ This is what the Act says, although it was actually section 2

⁵ Disapplied by section 3(3) of the Act of Common Council of 4 June 2001

(iii) [...] ⁶

(iv) [...] ⁷

[...] ⁸

Approval of Persons elected to the Office of Alderman

5. The Court of Lord Mayor and Aldermen is deemed to have approved any person qualified to be elected to the office of Alderman under section 3 and so elected.

Abolition of Fines and Penalties upon Aldermen

6. (1) The provisions of an Act of Common Council made on the seventeenth day of April 1812 and entitled “An Act concerning the Election and Discharge of Aldermen of this City, and to prevent Expenses at such Elections” for an Alderman elected but refusing to take office to be liable to a fine unless he is discharged from the said office owing to insufficiency of estate shall cease to have effect.
- (2) Without prejudice to subsection (1), no rule, provision or practice shall be made providing for fines or other penalties upon Aldermen, or for their discharge from the office of Aldermen on account of resources at their disposal.

Regulation of Precedence or Seniority of Aldermen

7. (1) It is hereby declared for the avoidance of doubt that the Court of Lord Mayor and Aldermen or any committee thereof duly authorised by that Court shall have power from time to time and at their discretion to determine the precedence or seniority of Aldermen in relation to each other in the said Court.
- (2) The effect of any exercise of power contained in subsection (1) may be published in the form of lists of Aldermen or otherwise.
- (3) All instruments, documents, customs and practices which relate to the precedence or seniority of Aldermen shall be construed and determined so as to be in accordance with the exercise of the power to which this section relates.

PART III – THE SHRIEVALTY

Amendment to Provisions relating to the Nomination and Election of Sheriffs

8. Without prejudice to the generality of section 7, an Act of Common Council made and passed on the twenty-first day of January 1932 entitled “An Act of Common Council to consolidate and amend the Law relating to the Nomination and Election of Sheriffs of the City of London” shall have effect subject to the following modifications--

⁶ Disapplied by section 4(2) of the Act of Common Council of 4 June 2001

⁷ The provision inserting section 4A into the Act of Common Council of 14 July 1960 was disapplied by section 4(3) of the Act of Common Council of 04 June 2001

⁸ The provision inserting section 4B into the Act of Common Council of 14 July 1960 was repealed by section 7 of the Act of Common Council of 16 May 2013

- (i) Section 7 is repealed;
- (ii) In section 10, for the word “two”, the word “fifteen” shall be inserted;
- (iii) In section 12, the words “an Alderman or” shall be omitted; and,
- (iv) In section 13, the words “The Alderman or Aldermen of this City in nomination in accordance with the provisions of Clause 7 hereof, and if more than one, according to their seniority in the said Court of Lord Mayor and Aldermen” shall be omitted.

PART IV – COMMON COUNCILMEN

Common Councilmen – Vacancies and Numbers

[9. (1) ...

- (2) This section shall apply to all Wards and Sides of Wards of the City and the Common Councilmen for those Wards and Sides of Wards except for the Ward of Farringdon Without and the Common Councilmen for that Ward and Sides thereof.
- (3) Where, apart from the provisions of this subsection, a vacancy would arise by reason of the death, resignation or disqualification of a Common Councilman for a Ward or Side of a Ward, either:-
 - (i) during his period of office, or
 - (ii) at any time after his election as a Common Councilman but before the Declaration is subscribed by him,

there shall be deemed not to be a vacancy for a Common Councilman for that Ward or Side and with effect from the next annual election for Common Councilmen in that Ward or Side the number of Common Councilmen representing the said Ward or Side shall (subject to the provisions of subsection (6) below as respects the Ward of Bishopsgate) be reduced by one.

- (4) In this subsection “the Declaration” means the declaration of a person elected to the office of Common Councilman as required by the Promissory Oaths Act 1868 or any declaration substituted therefor from time to time, and for the purpose of this section only a person who has been elected as Common Councilman but has not subscribed the Declaration shall be deemed to be a Common Councilman.
- (5) When a Common Councilman for a Ward or Side does not appear as a candidate for re-election in relation to that Ward or Side at a time when it is not possible under the procedures from time to time applicable to Ward elections, to reduce the number of Common Councilmen in accordance with this section, that reduction shall be effected at the next subsequent annual Ward election.
- (6) In relation to the Ward of Bishopsgate, subsections (3) and (5) of this section shall have effect in relation to a Ward election so as to reduce the number of Common Councilmen representing that Ward by two (once on two successive occasions when either of those subsections has effect) and when such reduction has taken effect neither

subsection shall thereafter apply to that Ward or the Common Councilmen representing it.

- (7) Subject to subsection (6) of this section, subsections (3) and (5) shall have effect in relation to a Ward election so as to reduce the number of Common Councilmen representing a Ward or Side by one, and when such reduction has taken effect in relation to a Ward or Side neither subsection shall thereafter apply to that Ward or Side or the Common Councilmen representing it.]⁹

⁹ Substituted by section 5 of the Act of Common Council of 4 June 2001

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|---|--|
| Committee(s): Education Board – for decision Policy & Resources Committee – for decision | Dated: 3 December 2021 16 December 2021 |
| Subject: Review of funding to the Guildhall School of Music & Drama for scholarships | Public |
| Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly? | 3, 7, 8 |
| Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending? | N (represents a continuation of existing funding) |
| If so, how much? | £30,000 pa |
| What is the source of Funding? | City’s Cash |
| Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department? | Y/N |
| Report of: the Principal, Guildhall School of Music & Drama | For Decision |
| Report authors: Group Accountant, Guildhall School & Head of Development, Guildhall School | |

Summary

This report reviews the City Corporation’s payment of £30,000 per annum to the Guildhall School of Music and Drama (the School), as part of the implementation of the City Corporation’s Grants Service Based Review. This payment has historically been used to fund scholarships. This report demonstrates the impact of the funds on the School and on the scholarship recipients in 2021/22. Members are asked to note the report on the use of funds in 2021/22 and to agree to continue the annual payment for the financial years 2022/23 & 23/24.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Review and approve as satisfactory the submission of the School’s impact report on the use of the £30,000 grant in 2021/22;
- Approve the grant continuation to 2022/23 and 2023/24 on the basis of this satisfactory submission.

Main Report

Background

1. A one-off grant payment of £30,000 for 2005/06 was approved by the Finance Grants Sub-Committee in May 2005 to The Guildhall School Trust (the Trust) (Charity No. 1082472, Company No. 04041975) to go towards the cost of UK and EU bursaries. A £30,000 payment has been made annually for scholarships since then, into the School’s account via journal payment, rather than the Guildhall School Trust’s account.
2. The annual payment has been used for scholarships, going into the School’s scholarships account and was awarded as an unrestricted award to help attract the best artists to the School and London.

Current position

3. The environment in which the School operates has changed significantly since 2005. Tuition fees for home students are now three times higher at £9,250 and the School has closer to 1,100 FTE when compared to around 800 in 2005. The School's competitors are in a position where they can offer both full fee and maintenance scholarships in order to attract and secure the best talent.
4. The Covid-19 pandemic and Brexit has had a negative impact on recruitment from the EU and around the world, making the need for Scholarship funding greater than ever. While the grant from the City is clearly targeted at students from the UK and will be a significant support to them, having this will enable the School to free up funds from other donors to support other students in genuine need.
5. The School awarded £3.465m in Scholarships (both fee and maintenance awards based on merit) for the 2021/22 Academic Year, and anticipated a similar level of need in 2022/23. In a highly competitive market place any Scholarship offer is an important one.

Proposal

6. This report requests that the City Corporation approves the renewal of the 2-year funding commitment to the School of £30,000 p.a. for scholarships for the financial years 2022/23 and 2023/24.
7. It is also proposed that the School reports back annually to the Education Board on the number of Scholarships awarded and the impact of the £30,000 grant.

Implications

8. As the £30,000 payment is made from the City's Cash Finance account, and would continue to be made out of that account, there are no financial implications for the Education Board's budget.

Conclusion

9. This paper reviews the Guildhall School's use of the £30,000 grant from the City's Cash for UK Scholarship support in 2021/22 and asks Members to approve the renewal of the grant for 2022/23 and 2023/24, subject to the receipt of a further impact report in Autumn 2022.

Appendices

- None

Caroline Hawley

Head of Development – Guildhall School of Music & Drama

T: 020 7382 2313

E: caroline.hawley@gsmd.ac.uk

Graeme Hood

Group Accountant – Guildhall School of Music & Drama

T: 020 7638 4141 ext 7842

E: graeme.hood@barbican.org.uk

Agenda Item 6

| | |
|--|---|
| Committee(s): Establishment Committee Policy & Resources Committee Court of Common Council | Dated: 3 December 2021 16 December 2021 13 January 2022 |
| Subject: 2022/23 Pay Policy Statement | Public |
| Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly? | N/A |
| Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending? | No |
| If so, how much? | £ |
| What is the source of Funding? | |
| Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department? | No |
| Report of: Jan Davies, Interim Executive Director of Human Resources | For Decision |
| Report author: Ian Simpson, Corporate HR Unit, Chief Operating Office | |

Summary

The Localism Act 2011 requires the City of London Corporation to prepare and publish a Pay Policy Statement setting out its approach to pay for the most senior and junior members of staff for the succeeding financial year. This must be agreed each year by the full Court of Common Council. Preceding this, the Statements have been considered in previous years by the Establishment and Policy & Resources Committees. In order to fit in with other commitments of the Establishment Committee in January, and the subsequent electoral cycle, the Statement is this year presented earlier than usual.

Statements have been produced each financial year since 2012/13. They are generally written to incorporate the requirements of the relevant legislation and its Government Guidance but updated as relevant City of London pay information or policies change.

The Statement was altered in format last year following discussions with the now-Chair of the Establishment Committee, such that it divided its main sections into a “policy overview” and details of that policy’s current implementation. That format has been followed again this year. It still, however, contains all the essential requirements that the legislation requires to be incorporated into the statutory Statement.

This report sets out the legislative requirements under which Pay Policy Statements are produced.

It should be noted that Pay Policy Statements are not, as such, a “statement on pay policies”, but rather a narrowly defined legislative requirement spelling out clearly and transparently certain specified current pay practices. As such they are required to be an “as is” statement, rather than a prediction of what will happen. Although the Statements in format have (legally) in their title the financial year following their date of publication, they are required to be an accurate statement of practice at the time of publication, not a prediction of what will or may happen over the succeeding 12 months.

The draft 2022/23 Pay Policy Statement is attached as an Appendix, along with a version of it showing tracked changes from the 2021/22 Statement as agreed by the Court in March.

The Statement was agreed by Establishment Committee on 3 December, and is now required to be agreed by the Policy & Resources Committee before proceeding to Court of Common Council.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to agree the Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23 and recommend it to the Court of Common Council.

Main Report

Background

1. The requirement for local authorities to produce Pay Policy Statements was introduced under section 38(1) of the Localism Act 2011 (the Act). This states that “*A relevant authority must prepare a pay policy statement for the financial year 2012-2013 and each subsequent financial year*”. In the City Corporation’s case, it is a “*relevant authority*” only in its capacity as a local authority. However, and in general, the City has not tried to distinguish in its Pay Policy Statements its local-authority capacities from any of its other undertakings, other than where these are specifically excluded from the remit of the 2011 Act.
2. The aim of the Act is that authorities should be open, transparent and accountable to local taxpayers, and this advice is repeated or expanded upon in various pieces of Government guidance, and a Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency, having statutory effect. The main themes of these are transparency, fairness and accountability. Pay Policy Statements should set out the authority’s approach to issues relating to the pay of its workforce, and in particular to the pay of its “Chief Officers” and the pay of its lowest paid employees.

3. Section 38 of the Act goes on to outline certain features which must be included within Pay Policy Statements.
 - Section 38(2) says that the Statements must set out the authority's policies for the financial year relating to the remuneration of its chief officers, the remuneration of its lowest-paid employees and the relationship between the remuneration of its chief officers and the remuneration of any other employees.
 - Section 38(3) says that the Statements must state the definition of "lowest-paid" employee adopted by the authority and its reasons for adopting that definition.
 - Section 38(4) says that the Statements must include the authority's policies relating to the level and elements of remuneration for each chief officer, remuneration of chief officers on recruitment, increases and additions to remuneration for each chief officer, the use of performance-related pay and bonuses for chief officers, the approach to the payment of chief officers when they cease to be employed and the publication of and access to information relating to chief officers' remuneration.
4. The definition of "Chief Officers" given in the Localism Act (under section 43(2)) is that of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, and incorporates the latter Act's definitions of both "Chief Officers" and "Deputy Chief Officers". This is a much wider definition than the conventional definition of "Chief Officer" used in the City Corporation (generally denoting a head of department) and also wider than that which governs posts included in our Senior Management Group.
5. Under the Local Government and Housing Act, a "Chief Officer" is
 - the authority's head of the paid service (the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, in the City Corporation's case),
 - any person who in general answers directly to the head of the paid service, and
 - any person (irrespective of whether they report directly to the head of the paid service) who in general is required to report directly to the authority itself or to any Committee or sub-Committee of the authority.
6. A "Deputy Chief Officer" under the Act is anyone who reports directly to any person defined as a Chief Officer.
7. The only employees who could be caught by any of these definitions who are excluded from them under the 1989 Act are those employees engaged

principally in clerical or secretarial support, or who are responsible for other support services.

8. The 1989 Act applies to the City only in its capacities as a local authority, police authority and port health authority. However, in keeping with the commitment to wider transparency in our Pay Policy Statements, the basic definitions of “Chief Officer” and “Deputy Chief Officer” given in the 1989 Act have been applied in our Pay Policy Statements to all relevant employees of the City Corporation, irrespective of the capacity or capacities they work under, other than where their duties are specifically excluded from the provisions of the Localism Act.
9. The Localism Act makes supplementary provisions relating to Pay Policy Statements in its section 39. This says that the authority’s Pay Policy Statement must be approved by a resolution of the authority by the 31 March before the financial year to which it relates, that the Statement may (again by resolution of the authority) be subsequently amended after the beginning of the financial year, and that, as soon as is reasonably practicable after its approval or amendment, the Statement must be published on the authority’s website.
10. The general notion of the Act in relation to the Statements is that *“the Act’s provisions will ensure that communities have access to the information they need to determine whether remuneration, particularly senior remuneration, is appropriate and commensurate with responsibility. In addition, the provisions will ensure that policies on the pay and reward of the most senior staff are set out clearly within the context of the pay of the wider workforce”*

Current Position - City of London Pay Policy Statement 2022/23

11. A draft Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23 is attached. This is required to be approved by the Establishment and Policy & Resources Committees before being forwarded to the full Court of Common Council. It follows the format of last year’s Statement, in that its main sections (after an introduction covering the legislative requirements in producing Statements) are now divided into a Policy Overview (Paragraphs 7-31), giving the background to policies relevant to the statutory requirements of Pay Policy Statements, and an account of Policy Implementation (Paragraphs 33-50), giving the current position of how such policies are implemented.
12. A version showing tracked changes from the 2021/22 Statement as approved by the Court in March is also attached, such that Members can see at a glance where changes have been made. These include where figures and other statistical information have been changed within various tables that appear in the Statement.
13. It should be noted that a Pay Policy Statement is not, as such, a “statement on pay policies”, giving an account of all matters connected with remuneration in local authorities, but the putting into practice of a narrowly defined legislative requirement. The information presented by this statutory requirement has to

be clear and accessible, and it is in keeping with that requirement to ensure that extraneous material is kept to a minimum.

14. In keeping with this, Pay Policy Statements are also meant to be an accurate account of current pay practices. These may change over the course of the year covered by the Statement, but it is not the job of the Statement to make predictions on this. Legislation allows Statements to be changed as policy or practice alters over the year, but until it does the Statement should reflect what is the current situation.

Conclusion

15. To meet the requirements of the Localism Act, the City Corporation must agree and publish a Pay Policy Statement before each financial year. This report introduces for approval the draft Statement for 2022/23 and recommends its forwarding to the Policy & Resources Committee and Court of Common Council for the further necessary approvals.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Draft Pay Policy Statement 2022/23

Appendix 2: Draft Pay Policy Statement 2022/23 showing tracked changes from 2021/22

Ian Simpson, Pay and Grading Manager, Corporate HR, Town Clerk's Department

E: ian.simpson@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION
PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2022-2023

LEGISLATIVE OVERVIEW

1. Section 38(i) of the Localism Act 2011 (the Act) has required local authorities since the financial year 2012-2013 to produce a Pay Policy Statement in advance of each financial year. The Act requires local authorities to set out in their Statements their policies on a range of issues, particularly those relating to remuneration for their most senior and lowest-paid staff. This must include significant information on pay and reward for Chief Officers (as defined in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989). The Statement must be reviewed annually and agreed by “*a resolution of the authority*”, in the City of London Corporation’s case by the Court of Common Council. This document meets the requirements of the Act for the City of London Corporation for the financial year 2022-2023.
2. The provisions of the Act require that authorities are more open about their local policies and how local decisions are made. The Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency enshrines the principles of transparency and asks authorities to follow three principles when publishing data they hold: responding to public demand; releasing data in open formats available for re-use; and releasing data in a timely way. This includes data on senior salaries and the structure of the workforce.
3. The Act applies to the City of London Corporation only in its capacity as a local authority. It should be noted that not all of the pay and employment costs incurred by the City of London Corporation are carried out in this capacity, or even funded from public resources. As well as having statutory local authority functions, the Corporation undertakes other public functions, such as those of a police authority and of a port health authority. It also has private and charitable functions which receive funding through income from endowment and trust funds, and the pay and employment costs of these functions are met from these funds and are outside the scope of the Act.
4. In general, and in keeping with the spirit of openness, this Statement does not try to distinguish between information which applies to the City Corporation as a local authority and that which applies to it in any of its other capacities. However, insofar as the Act specifically excludes police authorities from its remit, this Statement does not include information about Police Officers.
5. Likewise, paragraph 7 of the Government Guidance for authorities on “*Openness and accountability in local pay*” (which has statutory effect under s40 of the Act for authorities in the preparation of their Pay Policy Statements) advises that “*The provisions in the Act do not apply to the staff of local authority schools and therefore teaching staff need not be brought within the scope of a pay policy statement*”. The City of London Corporation does not directly manage any local authority schools, but it does directly run three independent schools, and while some information about the remuneration of the teaching staff in these schools is provided in the Statement, in general the Statement follows the Government Guidance and leaves teaching staff outside of its scope.

6. The Act does not require authorities to publish specific numerical data on pay and reward in their Pay Policy Statement. However, information in this Statement should fit with any data on pay and reward which is published separately. The City Corporation operates consistent pay policies which are applied across all of its functions. Further details of the current Grade structures and associated pay scales are provided below in the section on "Policy Overview" (paragraphs 11-17) and "Policy Implementation" (paragraphs 32 and 36-43).

POLICY OVERVIEW

Background and fundamental rationale

7. All pay and terms and conditions of service are locally negotiated with the Corporation's recognised trade unions or staff representatives. In 2006-2007 extensive work was undertaken on a review of pay and grading structures. As a result, the principles set out in the guidance to the Act have already generally been addressed although the Act set out some additional requirements which are covered by this Statement.
8. In 2007, the Corporation implemented a number of core principles, via collective agreement, to form the City Corporation's pay strategy. This now focusses on a balance between incremental progression, individual performance and contribution to the success of the organisation. The main body of City Corporation employees are paid according to a Grade structure of 10 Grades (Grades A-J), with the most senior posts in a separate Senior Management Grade. Both the A-J Grades and the Senior Management Grade retain incremental progression, but this has since 2007 been determined by performance measured through appraisal over the year 1 April - 31 March. In 2020 and 2021, on account of the operational difficulties arising from the pandemic, this policy was waived for the year, such that failure to progress incrementally was by exception rather than through measured performance.
9. The provisions made in the 2007 pay review gave employees in Grades D-J and the Senior Management Grade access to "Contribution Payments" if the employees were at the top of their respective Grades. In years when these payments are in operation, achievement of them is also determined by appraisal over the same 1 April - 31 March time period. The payments are not contractual and are therefore made at the employer's discretion. In 2021, no Contribution Payments were made.
10. All incremental progressions are implemented from 1 October following the ending of the appraisal year, and Contribution Payments earned from appraisal are (when made) paid in the same October. In general, a fundamental element of the strategy is that achievement of payments related to performance is more onerous and exacting the more senior the member of staff.

Grading structure

11. All non-teaching staff employed by the City Corporation below the Senior Management Grade are allocated to one of the 10 A-J Grades, other than in a small number of exceptional cases, such as Apprentices. All such posts were reviewed under Job Evaluation, ranked in order and allocated to a Grade following the 2007 Review. The

evaluation scheme was independently equalities-impact assessed to ensure that it was inherently fair and unbiased. New posts and any existing posts that change their levels of responsibility etc. continue to be evaluated and ranked under the scheme. The scheme, how it is applied, the scoring mechanism and how scores relate to Grades are published on the Corporation's Intranet, so staff can be assured that the process is fair and transparent. In addition, there is an appeal mechanism agreed with the recognised trade unions and staff representatives.

12. Grades A-C are the lowest Grades in the City of London Corporation. Grade A has 3 increments and Grades B and C have 6 increments, and progression through each Grade can be achieved by annual incremental progression, subject to satisfactory performance. There is no Contribution Pay assessment. However, employees at the top of these Grades have the opportunity if they have undertaken exceptional work to be considered for a Recognition Award, up to a maximum level set corporately each year (this has been £500 in each year since 2010).
13. Grades D-J have 4 'core' increments and 2 'contribution' increments. Progression through the 4 'core' increments is subject to satisfactory performance. Progression into and through the 2 'contribution' increments can require performance to be at a higher than satisfactory level. Once at the top of the scale, for those who achieve the highest standards of performance and contribution, it is possible (subject to the employer's discretion in any given year) to earn a one-off non-consolidated Contribution Payment of up to 6% of basic pay depending on the assessed level of contribution over the previous year. The appraisal system recognises four levels of performance - Improvement Required, Good, Very Good and Outstanding, and those employees at the top of Grades D-J who achieve either of the top two ratings can (in years when the system is authorised to operate) receive a Contribution Payment.
14. A separate performance-payment scheme is in place for a small group of employees at the Barbican Centre engaged in commercial activities. These staff may receive payments of up to £4,000 or £6,000 per annum, depending on Grades and their success in meeting certain performance targets. The staff involved are excluded from the Recognition Awards and Contribution Payments schemes applying to other employees on their Grades.
15. The Senior Management Grade comprises the most senior roles in the organisation, as determined by Job Evaluation. Posts on the Senior Management Grade (SMG) are those which are the professional lead for a significant area of City Corporation business, with the nature of the professional responsibility held being that the postholders are not only directing the function for which they are responsible towards meeting corporate strategic goals but are required to determine from their professional point of view how these corporate goals should be constructed. As the SMG posts are distinct roles, they are individually evaluated and assessed independently against the external market allowing each post to be allocated an individual salary range within the Grade, which incorporates market factors as well as corporate importance. Any increase in salary (whether through incremental progression or a cost-of-living award) is entirely dependent on each individual being subject to a rigorous process of assessment and evaluation, based on the contribution of the individual to the success of the organisation. SMG posts are not necessarily the best-paid in the organisation,

as other posts in Grades I and J may be better paid than some SMG posts, depending on the separate market supplements applied to the Graded posts.

16. Following approval by the Court of Common Council of a new Target Operating Model and Organisation Design, the Senior Management Grade will, from 1 April 2021, comprise the following posts:

- Town Clerk & Chief Executive
- Deputy Town Clerk & Chief Executive
- Chief Operating Officer
- Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer
- Comptroller & City Solicitor
- Remembrancer
- City Surveyor & Executive Director, Property
- Executive Director, Community & Children's Services
- Executive Director, Environment
- Executive Director, Innovation & Growth
- Executive Director, Human Resources
- Assistant Town Clerk & Executive Director, Governance & Members' Services
- Executive Director, Communications & External Affairs
- Chief Strategy Officer
- Executive Director & Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor
- Executive Director & Private Secretary to the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee
- Managing Director, Barbican Centre
- Managing Director, Bridge House Estates
- Principal, Guildhall School of Music & Drama
- Open Spaces Director

17. The Head Teachers of the City of London School, City of London School for Girls and City of London Freeman's School are not part of the Senior Management Grade for the purposes of pay (their pay is governed by a separate senior teaching pay scale, as outlined in paragraph 5). The pay of the post of Remembrancer is aligned to Senior Civil Service pay scales at Senior Civil Service Grade 3 (SCS 3)

18. Following the principles outlined above, the pay ranges for the Senior Management Grade were set with reference to both job evaluation and an independent external market assessment. The principles of this were agreed by the Court of Common Council in 2007 and, subsequently, the specific unique range for each senior management post was agreed by the Establishment Committee in October 2007, subject to alteration thereafter when the duties or responsibilities of posts or other external factors relevant to their pay and reward change.

Other contractual payments

19. In addition to basic salary, all Graded staff are paid a London Weighting allowance which varies depending on where they are based and whether they are supplied by

the employer with residential accommodation necessary for the purposes of fulfilling the duties of their job. This is to assist staff with the higher cost of living and working in London.

20. As most of the work of the organisation is undertaken in the City of London, there are some types of posts which are difficult to recruit to (e.g. lawyers, IT staff etc.). Accordingly, there is often the need to use market supplements to attract, recruit and retain highly sought-after skills. These, where used, can be applied to employees in Grades A-J. Any request for a market supplement must be supported by independent market data and is considered by a panel of senior officers and, where appropriate depending on the amount proposed to be paid and the Grade of the post, by the Establishment Committee. All market supplement payments are kept under regular review, and regular reports on payments made are produced for the Establishment Committee.
21. The London Living Wage (LLW) has been applied as a minimum rate for all directly employed staff, including Apprentices, since April 2017. Casual staff and agency workers have also been paid the London Living Wage since 2014. Until 2018, LLW increases were applied from 1 April each year in line with the most recently announced LLW increase. However, in October 2018, the City Corporation's Policy & Resources Committee agreed that LLW increases should be applied in this and future years to affected employees and other staff from the date of the increase's announcement, which in 2021 was on 15 November (an increase of 1.84%).
22. The Establishment Committee has specific authority to deal with or make recommendations to the Court of Common Council where appropriate on all matters relating to the employment of City of London Corporation employees where such matters are not specifically delegated to another Committee. These matters include the remuneration of senior officers. The Establishment Committee has delegated this to its Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee.

Transparency

23. The Government guidance to the Act (which has statutory effect) requires the Pay Policy Statement to make reference to policies in relation to staff leaving the authority, senior staff moving posts within the public sector, senior staff recruitment, and re-employment of senior postholders who have left the authority, particularly in relation to arrangements which might be made in such an event that would appear to have the intention of minimising tax payments made by the re-engaged former employee.

Recruitment

24. New staff, including those in the Senior Management Grade, are normally appointed to the bottom of the particular pay scale applicable for the post. If the existing salary falls within the pay scale for the post, the new employee is normally appointed to the lowest point on the scale which is higher than their existing salary provided this gives them a pay increase commensurate with the additional higher-level duties. In cases where the existing salary is higher than all points on the pay scale for the new role, the member of staff is normally appointed to the top of the pay scale for the role.

For posts where the salary is £100,000 or more, the following approvals will be required:

- (i) in respect of all new posts, the Court of Common Council;
- (ii) in respect of all existing posts, the Establishment Committee.

Payments on Ceasing Office

25. Staff who leave the City Corporation, including the Town Clerk & Chief Executive and staff on the Senior Management Grade, are not entitled to receive any payments from the authority, except in the case of redundancy or retirement as indicated below.

Retirement

26. Staff who contribute to the Local Government Pension Scheme who retire from age 55 onwards are able to elect to receive immediate payment of their pension benefits on a reduced basis in accordance with the Scheme.

27. Unreduced benefits are payable if retirement is from Normal Pension Age, with normal pension age linked to the State Pension Age from 1 April 2014, unless protections in the Pension Scheme allow for an earlier date. Early retirement, with immediate payment of pension benefits, is also possible under the Pension Scheme following dismissal on redundancy or business efficiency grounds from age 55 onwards and on grounds of permanent ill-health at any age.

28. Whilst the Local Government Pension Scheme allows applications for flexible retirement from staff aged 55 or over, where staff reduce their hours or Grade, it has in general been the City Corporation's policy to agree to these only where there are clear financial or operational advantages to the organisation. Benefits are payable in accordance with Regulation 27 of the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013.

Redundancy

29. Staff who are made redundant are entitled to receive statutory redundancy pay as set out in legislation calculated on a week's pay (currently a maximum of £544 per week). The City Corporation currently bases the calculation on 1.5 x actual salary. This scheme may be amended from time to time subject to Member approval, and has most recently been so amended for staff made redundant on or after 25 October 2017. The authority's policy on discretionary compensation for relevant staff under the Local Government (Early Termination of Employment) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 is published on the Corporation's website.

Settlement of potential claims

30. Where a member of staff leaves the City Corporation's service in circumstances which would, or would be likely to, give rise to an action seeking redress through the courts from the organisation about the nature of the member of staff's departure from the Corporation's employment, such claims may be settled by way of a settlement agreement where it is in the City Corporation's interests to do so based on advice from the Comptroller & City Solicitor. The amount to be paid in any such instance may include an amount of compensation, which is appropriate in all the circumstances of the individual case. Should such a matter involve the departure of a member of staff

in the Senior Management Grade or the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, any such compensation payment will only be made following consultation with the Chairs of Policy & Resources and Establishment Committees and legal advice that it would be legal, proper and reasonable to pay it.

Payment in lieu of notice

31. In exceptional circumstances, where it suits service needs, payments in lieu of notice are made to staff on the termination of their contracts.

Re-employment

32. Applications for employment from staff who have retired or been made redundant from the City Corporation or another authority will be considered in accordance with the Corporation’s normal recruitment policy. The City Corporation does not engage former staff on contracts that enable tax payments to be minimised.

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AND CURRENT POSITION

Salary scales effective from 1 July 2021

33. A three-year pay award giving an increase of 2.25% on Base salaries and 5% on London Weighting for all employees in Grades A-J and the Senior Management Grade was agreed in March 2020. The planned increases would be effective from 1 July each year between 2020 and 2022.. The agreement on the Pay Award included a clause for renegotiation “in exceptional circumstances”, and in December 2020, in the light of the circumstances caused by the pandemic, and of the Chancellor’s recommended “pay pause” for public-sector workers, the City Corporation invoked this clause. As a result of this, the pay award for 2021/22 was a 1.525% increase on Base salaries of Grades A-C and no increases on any other pay. The current salary scales are given below.

| Grade | Min Salary (£) | Max Salary (£) | No. of employees |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Grade A | £16,650 | £17,670 | 149 |
| Grade B | £18,170 | £21,110 | 554 |
| Grade C | £23,730 | £27,530 | 813 |
| Grade D | £29,350 | £34,040 | 699 |
| Grade E | £34,040 | £39,440 | 560 |
| Grade F | £43,100 | £49,980 | 414 |
| Grade G | £51,460 | £59,690 | 184 |
| Grade H | £59,690 | £69,170 | 88 |
| Grade I | £69,170 | £80,170 | 25 |
| Grade J | £82,590 | £95,760 | 17 |
| Senior Management Grade (SMG) | £84,240 | £258,970 | 17 |

The figures given are for Base pay only. Employee numbers are those at the time of the November 2021 pay roll. Any employee on Grades A-J who manages or supervises another employee on the same Grade has a separate pay scale paying up to 6.1% greater than the

salary on the substantive Grade. Any employee on Grades A-J who is in a residential post has a separate pay scale paying 12.5% less than the salary on the substantive Grade. The figures for employees in each Grade in the table above include those on the relevant supervisory and residential scales. All employees on Grades A-J and in the SMG also receive a London Weighting allowance. The allowance does not differ between Grades of staff.

| | | |
|-----------------------|---------|----------|
| Teacher Grades | £29,490 | £60,250 |
| Senior Teacher Grades | £64,640 | £147,490 |

Figures for Teacher Grades exclude any additional responsibility allowances payable. Figures for Senior Teacher Grades include all payments.

This information is reviewed, updated and published on a regular basis in accordance with the guidance on data transparency and by the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011. It should be noted that all Police Officer pay scales are nationally determined and as such do not form part of the City Corporation's Pay Policy.

- 34. Current levels of London Weighting for non-residential staff are £6,710 for those based in inner London and £4,020 for those based in outer London. Separate rates (approximately 10% lower) are applied to residential staff.
- 35. The City Corporation subscribes to Croner's salary benchmarking. While this provides information on both public and private sector comparator jobs, general practice is to use the median level of comparator public-sector jobs in central London for organisations which employ between 1001 and 4000 staff, with a turnover of £50m-£100m as basis for establishing appropriate market rates.
- 36. The Act's provisions do not supersede the City Corporation's autonomy to make decisions on pay which are appropriate to local circumstances and deliver value for money for local taxpayers. The Corporation seek to be a fair employer and an employer of choice - recognising and rewarding the contributions of staff in an appropriate way. The Corporation set pay fairly within published scales and, in doing so, have regard to changing conditions in differing occupational and geographic labour markets.

Employees below the Senior Management Grade

- 37. The lowest Graded employees are in Grade A as determined by the outcomes of the Job Evaluation process. That Grade has been restructured in recent years such that its bottom and top points have risen higher up the pay scale. The current lowest point on Grade A is now £23,360, including a London Weighting allowance for working in Inner London. The current pay range for Grades A - J is £23,360 to £102,470 inclusive of Inner London Weighting of £6,710 for non-residential employees.
- 38. Under normal circumstances, in each October following the March end of the appraisal year, generally around two thirds of eligible employees have been allowed to move into the two higher contribution increments or to receive a one-off non-consolidated contribution payment. As stated earlier, in 2020 and 2021, normal practice was waived

as a result of the difficulties caused by the pandemic, and increments for eligible staff were allowed to be the default position.

Senior Management Grade

- 39. Current Senior Management salary scales are from £84,240 to £258,970, excluding London Weighting.
- 40. Each Senior Management Grade post is allocated a range around a datum point. There is a maximum and minimum (datum plus 9% and datum minus 6% respectively) above and below which no individual salary can fall. Where a pay increase for a member of staff would take them above the maximum in a given year, the excess amount above the maximum may be paid as a non-consolidated payment in that year. This does not form part of basic salary for the following year and will, therefore, have to be earned again by superior performance for it to be paid.
- 41. Each year the datum point advances by a percentage equivalent to any ‘cost of living’ pay award. Individual salaries would move according to the table below:

| Contribution Level | Salary Change |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| A Outstanding | Datum % change + up to 6% |
| B Very Good | Datum % change + up to 4% |
| C Good | Datum % change |
| D Improvement Required | 0.0% |

- 42. As with staff in Grades D-J, normal practice on progression through Grades or Contribution Payments for eligible staff was waived in 2020 and 2021. In 2021, SMG staff not on the top of their Grades received a 3% “incremental” progression through their individual pay scales, but no Contribution Payments were made to those at the top of their scales.
- 43. The Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee sets the initial salary on appointment, together with the individual salary band, for staff with posts in the Senior Management Grade. Thereafter, the Town Clerk & Chief Executive determines annual salary progression for SMG posts (other than in relation to their own) within (and up to the maximum of) the existing individual salary bands and in accordance with relevant reward policies, in consultation with the Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee. Any changes to the individual salary bands for SMG posts must be agreed by the Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee.
- 44. In respect of the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, the post’s salary and any Contribution Payments that may be due to its holder are determined by the Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee is advised by an Appraisal Panel comprising the Chairs of the Policy & Resources Committee (as the Town Clerk’s line manager), Establishment Committee, Finance Committee and General Purposes Committee of Aldermen. The Appraisal Panel set the Town Clerk’s annual objectives and review performance against those objectives, receiving a report from the Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee who conducts the annual appraisal meeting with the Town

Clerk. The Sub-Committee and Appraisal Panel are supported by the Director of Human Resources together with any appropriate external advisers.

45. Set out below are the broad pay ranges for the Senior Management Grade in 2020-2021, with the numbers in each band, excluding London Weighting. Each member of staff will have an individual salary scale within these broad ranges. (It should be noted that the figures below include the pay of employees who are acting up into two SMG posts which are currently vacant. A further SMG post is also vacant but there is not an employee acting up into it.)

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| £84,240 - £120,070 | (4) |
| £121,260 - £152,110 | (7) |
| £156,670 - £181,520 | (7) |
| £223,370 - £258,970 | (1) |

Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers

46. The Act specifies that information should be given in Pay Policy Statements about the determination of remuneration for Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers as defined under the Local Government & Housing Act 1989, including approaches to the award of other elements of remuneration including bonuses and performance-related pay as well as severance payments. This should include any policy to award additional fees paid to Chief Officers or Deputy Chief Officers for their local election duties. The 1989 Act applies to the City Corporation only in its capacities as a local authority, police authority and port health authority, but as with other parts of this Statement, details are given for all employees who would satisfy the basic definitions of Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers given in the 1989 Act, other than schoolteachers and those who work in general for the City Corporation in its capacity as a police authority.

47. According to the definitions given in the 1989 Act (but widened in their interpretation as described in the paragraph above), as of 19 November 2021, the City Corporation had 30 filled Chief Officer posts and 122 filled Deputy Chief Officer posts. The 30 Chief Officer posts comprised the 17 posts within the Senior Management Grade plus the following numbers of posts within the A-J Grades:

- Grade J 7
- Grade I 4
- Grade H 1

plus one post paid at a spot salary owing to the nature of its employment.

The 122 Deputy Chief Officer posts were made up of posts at the following Grades:

- Grade J 13
- Grade I 18
- Grade H 43
- Grade G 25
- Grade F 21

plus two posts paid at spot salaries owing to the nature of their employment and/or funding.

48. The distinctions between SMG pay and payments made to employees on other Grades are outlined in the relevant sections of this Statement above. The most significant element of pay able to be received by employees in Grades A-J that is not available to SMG posts is market supplements. 7 Chief Officers in Grades I-J receive these payments as do 53 Deputy Chief Officers in Grades F-J. 2 of the Deputy Chief Officers in Grade F receive additional payments for working contractual hours in addition to the standard 35 per week on most City Corporation contracts. One Deputy Chief Officer on Grade F receives occasional additional payments for participating in electoral activities. One Deputy Chief Officer (Grade J) receives additional payments for undertaking standby duties.

49. In cash terms, the payments per annum made to Chief Officers (including those in the SMG) and Deputy Chief Officers fall into the following broad pay bands:

| <u>£ per annum</u> | <u>Chief Officers</u> | <u>Deputy Chief Officers</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| 40,000 – 50,000 | - | 18 |
| 51,000 – 60,000 | 1 | 25 |
| 61,000 – 70,000 | - | 24 |
| 71,000 – 80,000 | 2 | 15 |
| 81,000 – 90,000 | 4 | 13 |
| 91,000 – 100,000 | - | 12 |
| 101,000 – 110,000 | 4 | 6 |
| 111,000 – 120,000 | 4 | 3 |
| 121,000 – 140,000 | 5 | 5 |
| 141,000 – 160,000 | 4 | - |
| 161,000 – 199,000 | 5 | - |
| <u>200,000 – 255,00</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> |
| <u>Total employees</u> | <u>30</u> | <u>122</u> |

All payments outlined in the table above exclude London Weighting payments.

50. As mentioned earlier, the City Corporation is currently undertaking a significant review of its structure and services. This is due to be implemented this year, and it may have some effect on the numbers and the remuneration of Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers employed.

51. The schemes for incremental pay increases and Contribution Payments for employees in Grades D-J and the Senior Management Grade are set out in the relevant sections of this Statement above. These apply to Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers, depending on whether they are in one of the D-J Grades or the SMG. No Chief Officer or Deputy Chief Officer has an element of their basic pay “at risk” to be earned back each year. Progression through Grades is, however, subject to successful performance, assessed through the application of the performance-appraisal scheme. Contribution Payments for any Chief Officer or Deputy Chief Officer are only available

(when authorised) to those at the top of their Grades. These must also be earned through performance appraisal, and all such payments are non-consolidated, meaning that any recurrence of the payment has again to be earned through performance in future years.

52. The Act requires authorities to set out their policies on remuneration for their highest-paid staff alongside their policies towards their lowest-paid staff, and to explain what they think the relationship should be between the remuneration of their highest-paid staff and other staff. The City Corporation's pay multiple - the ratio between the highest paid and lowest paid permanent staff - is approximately 1:11. The ratio between the pay of the highest paid member of staff and the median earnings figure for all staff in the authority is approximately 1:7.

Publication of information relating to remuneration

53. The City Corporation will publish details of positions with remuneration of £50,000 or above in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 and the Local Government Transparency Code issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

54. This Pay Policy Statement will be published on the Corporation's public website. It may be amended at any time during 2021-2022 by resolution of the Court of Common Council. Any amendments will also be published on the Corporation's public website.

55. This statement meets the requirements of the: Localism Act 2011; the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) guidance on "Openness and accountability in local pay: Guidance under section 40 of the Localism Act" (including any supplementary Guidance issued); "The Local Government Transparency Code 2015"; and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.

56. From 2018, the City of London Corporation is required under the Equality Act 2010 to publish information every year showing the pay gap between male and female employees. The organisation's most recent such report was published in March 2020, and showed a diminution in the mean and median hourly-rate gender pay gap and an increase in the proportion of women in the upper quartile of employees by pay rates.

T. Graham
Chair, Establishment Committee

C. E. Lord, OBE JP
Deputy Chair, Establishment Committee

November 2022

CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION

PAY POLICY STATEMENT 202~~21~~-202~~32~~

LEGISLATIVE OVERVIEW

1. Section 38(i) of the Localism Act 2011 (the Act) has required local authorities since the financial year 2012-2013 to produce a Pay Policy Statement in advance of each financial year. The Act requires local authorities to set out in their Statements their policies on a range of issues, particularly those relating to remuneration for their most senior and lowest-paid staff. This must include significant information on pay and reward for Chief Officers (as defined in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989). The Statement must be reviewed annually and agreed by “*a resolution of the authority*”, in the City of London Corporation’s case by the Court of Common Council. This document meets the requirements of the Act for the City of London Corporation for the financial year 202~~21~~-202~~32~~.
2. The provisions of the Act require that authorities are more open about their local policies and how local decisions are made. The Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency enshrines the principles of transparency and asks authorities to follow three principles when publishing data they hold: responding to public demand; releasing data in open formats available for re-use; and releasing data in a timely way. This includes data on senior salaries and the structure of the workforce.
3. The Act applies to the City of London Corporation only in its capacity as a local authority. It should be noted that not all of the pay and employment costs incurred by the City of London Corporation are carried out in this capacity, or even funded from public resources. As well as having statutory local authority functions, the Corporation undertakes other public functions, such as those of a police authority and of a port health authority. It also has private and charitable functions which receive funding through income from endowment and trust funds, and the pay and employment costs of these functions are met from these funds and are outside the scope of the Act.
4. In general, and in keeping with the spirit of openness, this Statement does not try to distinguish between information which applies to the City Corporation as a local authority and that which applies to it in any of its other capacities. However, insofar as the Act specifically excludes police authorities from its remit, this Statement does not include information about Police Officers.
5. Likewise, paragraph 7 of the Government Guidance for authorities on “*Openness and accountability in local pay*” (which has statutory effect under s40 of the Act for authorities in the preparation of their Pay Policy Statements) advises that “*The provisions in the Act do not apply to the staff of local authority schools and therefore teaching staff need not be brought within the scope of a pay policy statement*”. The City of London Corporation does not directly manage any local authority schools, but it does directly run three independent schools, and while some information about the remuneration of the teaching staff in these schools is provided in the Statement, in general the Statement follows the Government Guidance and leaves teaching staff outside of its scope.

6. The Act does not require authorities to publish specific numerical data on pay and reward in their Pay Policy Statement. However, information in this Statement should fit with any data on pay and reward which is published separately. The City Corporation operates consistent pay policies which are applied across all of its functions. Further details of the current Grade structures and associated pay scales are provided below in the section on "Policy Overview" (paragraphs 11-17) and "Policy Implementation" (paragraphs 32 and 36-43).

POLICY OVERVIEW

Background and fundamental rationale

7. All pay and terms and conditions of service are locally negotiated with the Corporation's recognised trade unions or staff representatives. In 2006-2007 extensive work was undertaken on a review of pay and grading structures. As a result, the principles set out in the guidance to the Act have already generally been addressed, although the Act set out some additional requirements which are covered by this Statement.
8. In 2007, the Corporation implemented a number of core principles, via collective agreement, to form the City Corporation's pay strategy. This now focusses on a balance between incremental progression, individual performance and contribution to the success of the organisation. The main body of City Corporation employees are paid according to a Grade structure of 10 Grades (Grades A-J), with the most senior posts in a separate Senior Management Grade. Both the A-J Grades and the Senior Management Grade retain incremental progression, but this has since 2007 been determined by performance measured through appraisal over the year 1 April - 31 March. In (in 2020 and 2021, on account of the operational difficulties arising from the pandemic, this policy was waived for the year, such that failure to progress incrementally was by exception rather than through measured performance).
9. The provisions made in the 2007 pay review gave employees in Grades D-J and the Senior Management Grade also have access to "Contribution Payments" if the for employees were at the top of their ir respective Grades. In years when these payments are in operation, A achievement of the mse is also determined by appraisal over the same 1 April - 31 March time period. The payments are not contractual and are therefore made at the employer's discretion. In (although this was again waived in 2021, no Contribution Payments were made with a default Contribution Payment of 3% of Base pay being awarded to all eligible staff, other than where no payment was given for exceptional reasons).
10. All incremental progressions and Contribution Payments are implemented from 1 October following the ending of the appraisal year, and Contribution Payments earned from appraisal are (when made) paid in the same October. In general, a fundamental element of the general strategy (waived to some degree in 2020) is that achievement of payments related to performance is more onerous and exacting the more senior the member of staff.

Grading structure

11. All non-teaching staff employed by the City Corporation below the Senior Management Grade are allocated to one of the 10 A-J Grades, other than in a small number of exceptional cases, such as Apprentices. All such posts were reviewed under Job Evaluation, ranked in order and allocated to a Grade following the 2007 Review. The evaluation scheme was independently equalities-impact assessed to ensure that it was inherently fair and unbiased. New posts and any existing posts that change their levels of responsibility etc. continue to be evaluated and ranked under the scheme. The scheme, how it is applied, the scoring mechanism and how scores relate to Grades are published on the Corporation's Intranet, so staff can be assured that the process is fair and transparent. In addition, there is an appeal mechanism agreed with the recognised trade unions and staff representatives.
12. Grades A-C are the lowest Grades in the City of London Corporation. Grade A has 3 increments and Grades B and C have 6 increments, and progression through each Grade can be achieved by annual incremental progression, subject to satisfactory performance. There is no Contribution Pay assessment. However, employees at the top of these Grades have the opportunity if they have undertaken exceptional work to be considered for a Recognition Award, up to a maximum level set corporately each year (this has been £500 in each year since 2010).
13. Grades D-J have 4 'core' increments and 2 'contribution' increments. Progression through the 4 'core' increments is subject to satisfactory performance. Progression into and through the 2 'contribution' increments ~~can~~ requires performance to be at a higher than satisfactory level. Once at the top of the scale, for those who achieve the highest standards of performance and contribution, it is possible (subject to the employer's discretion in any given year) to earn a one-off non-consolidated Contribution Payment of up to 6% of basic pay depending on the assessed level of contribution over the previous year. The appraisal system recognises four levels of performance - Improvement Required, Good, Very Good and Outstanding, and those employees at the top of Grades D-J who achieve either of the top two ratings can (in years when the system is authorised to operate) receive a Contribution Payment. ~~In 2019, those in receipt of a "Very Good" rating could receive a payment of between 4 and 5% of Basic salary, and those earning an "Outstanding" rating would receive a payment of 6% of Basic salary. The variable payment for "Very Good" ratings was introduced in 2019 to recognise that there could be distinctions in performance of those so assessed, above the level of "Good" but not meriting an "Outstanding" assessment.~~
14. A separate performance-payment scheme is in place for a small group of employees at the Barbican Centre engaged in commercial activities. These staff may receive payments of up to £4,000 or £6,000 per annum, depending on Grades and their success in meeting certain performance targets. The staff involved are excluded from the Recognition Awards and Contribution Payments schemes applying to other employees on their Grades.
15. The Senior Management Grade comprises the most senior roles in the organisation, as determined by Job Evaluation. Posts on the Senior Management Grade (SMG) are those which are the professional lead for a significant area of City Corporation business, with the nature of the professional responsibility held being that the postholders are not only directing the function for which they are responsible towards

meeting corporate strategic goals, but are also required to determine from their professional point of view how these corporate goals should be constructed. As the SMG posts are distinct roles, they are individually evaluated and assessed independently against the external market allowing each post to be allocated an individual salary range within the Grade, which incorporates market factors as well as corporate importance. Any increase in salary (whether through incremental progression or a cost-of-living award) is entirely dependent on each individual being subject to a rigorous process of assessment and evaluation, based on the contribution of the individual to the success of the organisation. SMG posts are not necessarily the best-paid in the organisation, as other posts in Grades I and J may be better paid than some SMG posts, depending on the separate market supplements applied to the Graded posts.

16. Following approval by the Court of Common Council of a new Target Operating Model and Organisation Design, the Senior Management Grade will, from 1 April 2021, comprise the following posts:

- Town Clerk & Chief Executive
- Deputy Town Clerk & Chief Executive
- Chief Operating Officer
- Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer
- Comptroller & City Solicitor
- Remembrancer
- City Surveyor & Executive Director, Property
- Executive Director, Community & Children's Services
- Executive Director, Environment
- Executive Director, Innovation & Growth
- Executive Director, Human Resources
- Assistant Town Clerk & Executive Director, Governance & Members' Services
- Executive Director, Communications & External Affairs
- Chief Strategy Officer
- Executive Director & Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor
- Executive Director & Private Secretary to the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee
- Managing Director, Barbican Centre
- Managing Director, Bridge House Estates
- Principal, Guildhall School of Music & Drama
- Open Spaces Director

17. The Head Teachers of the City of London School, City of London School for Girls and City of London Freeman's School are not part of the Senior Management Grade for the purposes of pay (their pay is governed by a separate senior teaching pay scale, as outlined in paragraph 5). The pay of the post of Remembrancer is aligned to Senior Civil Service pay scales at Senior Civil Service Grade 3 (SCS3) at an equivalent to SCS-XX.

18. Following the principles outlined above, the pay ranges for the Senior Management Grade were set with reference to both job evaluation and an independent external market assessment. The principles of this were agreed by the Court of Common Council in 2007 and, subsequently, the specific unique range for each senior management post was agreed by the Establishment Committee in October 2007, subject to alteration thereafter when the duties or responsibilities of posts or other external factors relevant to their pay and reward change.

Other contractual payments

19. In addition to basic salary, all Graded staff are paid a London Weighting allowance which varies depending on where they are based and whether they are supplied by the employer with residential accommodation necessary for the purposes of fulfilling the duties of their job. This is to assist staff with the higher cost of living and working in London.

20. As most of the work of the organisation is undertaken in the City of London, there are some types of posts which are difficult to recruit to (e.g. lawyers, IT staff etc.). Accordingly, there is often the need to use market supplements to attract, recruit and retain highly sought-after skills. These, where used, can be applied to employees in Grades A-J. Any request for a market supplement must be supported by independent market data and is considered by a panel of senior officers and, where appropriate depending on the amount proposed to be paid and the Grade of the post, by the Establishment Committee. All market supplement payments are kept under regular review, and regular reports on payments made are produced for the Establishment Committee.

21. The London Living Wage (LLW) has been applied as a minimum rate for all directly employed staff, including Apprentices, since April 2017. Casual staff and agency workers have also been paid the London Living Wage since 2014. Until 2018, LLW increases were applied from 1 April each year in line with the most recently announced LLW increase. However, in October 2018, the City Corporation's Policy & Resources Committee agreed that LLW increases should be applied in this and future years to affected employees and other staff from the date of the increase's announcement, which in 2021¹⁰ was on 9¹⁵ November (an increase of 1.840.9%).

22. The Establishment Committee has specific authority to deal with or make recommendations to the Court of Common Council where appropriate on all matters relating to the employment of City of London Corporation employees where such matters are not specifically delegated to another Committee. These matters include the remuneration of senior officers. The Establishment Committee has delegated this to its Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee.

Transparency

23. The Government guidance to the Act (which has statutory effect) requires the Pay Policy Statement to make reference to policies in relation to staff leaving the authority, senior staff moving posts within the public sector, senior staff recruitment, and re-employment of senior postholders who have left the authority, particularly in relation

to arrangements which might be made in such an event that would appear to have the intention of minimising tax payments made by the re-engaged former employee.

Recruitment

24. New staff, including those in the Senior Management Grade, are normally appointed to the bottom of the particular pay scale applicable for the post. If the existing salary falls within the pay scale for the post, the new employee is normally appointed to the lowest point on the scale which is higher than their existing salary provided this gives them a pay increase commensurate with the additional higher-level duties. In cases where the existing salary is higher than all points on the pay scale for the new role, the member of staff is normally appointed to the top of the pay scale for the role.

For posts where the salary is £100,000 or more, the following approvals will be required:

- (i) in respect of all new posts, the Court of Common Council;
- (ii) in respect of all existing posts, the Establishment Committee.

Payments on Ceasing Office

25. Staff who leave the City Corporation, including the Town Clerk & Chief Executive and staff on the Senior Management Grade, are not entitled to receive any payments from the authority, except in the case of redundancy or retirement as indicated below.

Retirement

26. Staff who contribute to the Local Government Pension Scheme who retire from age 55 onwards are able to elect to receive immediate payment of their pension benefits on a reduced basis in accordance with the Scheme.

27. Unreduced benefits are payable if retirement is from Normal Pension Age, with normal pension age linked to the State Pension Age from 1 April 2014, unless protections in the Pension Scheme allow for an earlier date. Early retirement, with immediate payment of pension benefits, is also possible under the Pension Scheme following dismissal on redundancy or business efficiency grounds from age 55 onwards and on grounds of permanent ill-health at any age.

- ~~28. Whilst the Local Government Pension Scheme allows applications for flexible retirement from staff aged 55 or over, where staff reduce their hours or Grade, it has in general been the City Corporation's policy to agree to these only where there are clear financial or operational advantages to the organisation. Benefits are payable in accordance with Regulation 27 of the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013. Unless there are exceptional circumstances, the City has not made use of the discretion allowed by the LGPS Regulations to waive any actuarial reduction in pensions awarded under the flexible retirement provisions. However, as part of the fundamental review of its structure and services currently being undertaken in the organisation, a scheme has recently been operated whereby employees aged 60 or over could seek flexible retirement with an agreed departure date, to facilitate staffing restructures and the making of savings. Where the decision could be justified for these reasons, employees aged 55 or over were also allowed to participate in the scheme.~~

28.

Redundancy

~~30-29.~~ Staff who are made redundant are entitled to receive statutory redundancy pay as set out in legislation calculated on a week's pay (currently a maximum of £54438 per week). The City Corporation currently bases the calculation on 1.5 x actual salary. This scheme may be amended from time to time subject to Member approval, and has most recently been so amended for staff made redundant on or after 25 October 2017. The authority's policy on discretionary compensation for relevant staff under the Local Government (Early Termination of Employment) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 is published on the Corporation's website.

Settlement of potential claims

~~31-30.~~ Where a member of staff leaves the City Corporation's service in circumstances which would, or would be likely to, give rise to an action seeking redress through the courts from the organisation about the nature of the member of staff's departure from the Corporation's employment, such claims may be settled by way of a settlement agreement where it is in the City Corporation's interests to do so based on advice from the Comptroller & City Solicitor. The amount to be paid in any such instance may include an amount of compensation, which is appropriate in all the circumstances of the individual case. Should such a matter involve the departure of a member of staff in the Senior Management Grade or the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, any such compensation payment will only be made following consultation with the Chairs of Policy & Resources and Establishment Committees and legal advice that it would be legal, proper and reasonable to pay it.

Payment in lieu of notice

~~32-31.~~ In exceptional circumstances, where it suits service needs, payments in lieu of notice are made to staff on the termination of their contracts.

Re-employment

~~33-32.~~ Applications for employment from staff who have retired or been made redundant from the City Corporation or another authority will be considered in accordance with the Corporation's normal recruitment policy. The City Corporation does not engage former staff on contracts that enable tax payments to be minimised.

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AND CURRENT POSITION

Salary scales effective from 1 July 2021¹⁰

~~34-33.~~ A three-year pay award giving an increase of 2.25% on Base salaries and 5% on London Weighting for all employees in Grades A-J and the Senior Management Grade was agreed in March 2020. The planned increases would be effective from 1 July each year between 2020 and 2022, last year, to be effective from 1 July 2020. The agreement on the Pay Award included a clause for renegotiation "in exceptional circumstances"; and, in December 2020, in the light of the circumstances caused by the pandemic, and of the Chancellor's recommended "pay pause" for public-sector workers, the City Corporation invoked this clause. As -a result of this, the pay award for 2021/22 was a 1.525% increase on Base salaries of Grades A-C and no increases on any other pay. The current salary scales are given below.

| Grade | Min Salary (£) | Max Salary (£) | No. of employees |
|--|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Grade A | £16,40650 | £17,40670 | 1459 |
| Grade B | £187,17900 | £210,11790 | 55490 |
| Grade C | £23,7370 | £27,53120 | 813835 |
| Grade D | £29,350 | £34,040 | 699723 |
| Grade E | £34,040 | £39,440 | 56083 |
| Grade F | £43,100 | £49,980 | 41427 |
| Grade G | £51,460 | £59,690 | 18490 |
| Grade H | £59,690 | £69,170 | 887 |
| Grade I | £69,170 | £80,170 | 257 |
| Grade J | £82,590 | £95,760 | 1720 |
| Senior Management Grade (SMG) | £84,240 | £258,970 | 157 |
| <p>The figures given are for Base pay only. Employee numbers are those at the time of the November 2021January 2019 pay roll. Any employee on Grades A-J who manages or supervises another employee on the same Grade has a separate pay scale paying up to 6.1% greater than the salary on the substantive Grade. Any employee on Grades A-J who is in a residential post has a separate pay scale paying 12.5% less than the salary on the substantive Grade. The figures for employees in each Grade in the table above include those on the relevant supervisory and residential scales. All employees on Grades A-J and in the SMG also receive a London Weighting allowance. The allowance does not differ between Grades of staff.</p> | | | |
| Teacher Grades | £29,490 | £60,250 | |
| Senior Teacher Grades | £64,640 | £147,490 | |
| <p>Figures for Teacher Grades exclude any additional responsibility allowances payable. Figures for Senior Teacher Grades include all payments.</p> | | | |

This information is reviewed, updated and published on a regular basis in accordance with the guidance on data transparency and by the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011. It should be noted that all Police Officer pay scales are nationally determined and as such do not form part of the City Corporation's Pay Policy.

35-34. Current levels of London Weighting for non-residential staff are £6,710 for those based in inner London and £4,020 for those based in outer London. Separate rates (approximately 10% lower) are applied to residential staff.

36-35. The City Corporation subscribes to Croner's salary benchmarking system. While this provides information on both public and private sector comparator jobs, general practice is to use the median level of comparator public-sector jobs in central London for organisations which employ between 1001 and 4000 staff, with a turnover of £50m-£100m as basis for establishing appropriate market rates.

37-36. The Act's provisions do not supersede the City Corporation's autonomy to make decisions on pay which are appropriate to local circumstances and deliver value for money for local taxpayers. The Corporation seek to be a fair employer and an employer of choice - recognising and rewarding the contributions of staff in an appropriate way. The Corporation set pay fairly within published scales and, in doing so, have regard to changing conditions in differing occupational and geographic labour markets.

Employees below the Senior Management Grade

38-37. The lowest Graded employees are in Grade A as determined by the outcomes of the Job Evaluation process. That Grade has been restructured in recent years such that its bottom and top points have risen higher up the pay scale. The current lowest point on Grade A is now £23,41360, including a London Weighting allowance for working in Inner London. The current pay range for Grades A - J is £23,41360 to £102,470 inclusive of Inner London Weighting of £6,710 for non-residential employees.

39-38. Under normal circumstances, in each October following the March end of the appraisal year, generally around two thirds of eligible employees have been allowed to move into the two higher contribution increments or to receive a one-off non-consolidated contribution payment. As stated earlier, in 2020 and 2021, normal practice was waived as a result of the difficulties caused by the pandemic, and increments ~~or a 3% Contribution Payment~~ for eligible staff were allowed to be the default position.

Senior Management Grade

40-39. Current Senior Management salary scales are from £84,240 to £258,970, excluding London Weighting.

41-40. Each Senior Management Grade post is allocated a range around a datum point. There is a maximum and minimum (datum plus 9% and datum minus 6% respectively), above and below which no individual salary can fall. Where a pay increase for a member of staff would take them above the maximum in a given year, the excess amount above the maximum may be paid as a non-consolidated payment in that year. This does not form part of basic salary for the following year and will, therefore, have to be earned again by superior performance for it to be paid.

42-41. Each year the datum point advances by a percentage equivalent to any 'cost of living' pay award. Individual salaries would move according to the table below:

| Contribution Level | Salary Change |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| A Outstanding | Datum % change + up to 6% |
| B Very Good | Datum % change + up to 4% |
| C Good | Datum % change |
| D Improvement Required | 0.0% |

43-42. As with staff in Grades D-J, normal practice on progression through Grades or Contribution Payments for eligible staff was waived in 2020 and 2021, In 2021, and

SMG staff not on the top of their Grades received ~~either~~ a 3% “incremental” progression through their individual pay scales~~Grades, but no Contribution Payments were made to those at the top of their scales. or a 3% Contribution Payment, depending on eligibility.~~

44.43. The Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee sets the initial salary on appointment, together with the individual salary band, for staff with posts in the Senior Management Grade. Thereafter, the Town Clerk & Chief Executive determines annual salary progression for SMG posts (other than in relation to their own) within (and up to the maximum of) the existing individual salary bands and in accordance with relevant reward policies, in consultation with the Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee. Any changes to the individual salary bands for SMG posts must be agreed by the Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee.

45.44. In respect of the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, the post’s salary and any Contribution Payments that may be due to its holder are determined by the Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee is advised by an Appraisal Panel comprising the Chairs of the Policy & Resources Committee (as the Town Clerk’s line manager), Establishment Committee, Finance Committee and General Purposes Committee of Aldermen. The Appraisal Panel set the Town Clerk’s annual objectives and review performance against those objectives, receiving a report from the Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee who conducts the annual appraisal meeting with the Town Clerk. The Sub-Committee and Appraisal Panel are supported by the Director of Human Resources together with any appropriate external advisers.

46.45. Set out below are the broad pay ranges for the Senior Management Grade in 2020-2021, with the numbers in each band, excluding London Weighting. Each member of staff will have an individual salary scale within these broad ranges. (It should be noted that the figures below include the pay of employees who are acting up into two SMG posts which are currently vacant. A further SMG post is also vacant but there is not an employee acting up into it)

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| £84,240 - £120,070 | (24) |
| £121,260 - £152,110 | (7) |
| £156,670 - £1 81,520 <u>98,480</u> | (57) |
| £223,370 - £258,970 | (1) |

Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers

47.46. The Act specifies that information should be given in Pay Policy Statements about the determination of remuneration for Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers as defined under the Local Government & Housing Act 1989, including approaches to the award of other elements of remuneration including bonuses and performance-related pay as well as severance payments. This should include any policy to award additional fees paid to Chief Officers or Deputy Chief Officers for their local election duties. The 1989 Act applies to the City Corporation only in its capacities as a local authority, police authority and port health authority, but as with other parts of this Statement, details are given for all employees who would satisfy the basic definitions

of Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers given in the 1989 Act, other than schoolteachers and those who work in general for the City Corporation in its capacity as a police authority.

48.47. According to the definitions given in the 1989 Act (but widened in their interpretation as described in the paragraph above), as of 219 November~~January~~ 2021, the City Corporation had 30 filled Chief Officer posts and 122 filled Deputy Chief Officer posts. The 30 Chief Officer posts comprised the 175 posts within the Senior Management Grade plus the following numbers of posts within the A-J Grades:

- Grade J 447
- Grade I 4
- Grade H 1

plus one post paid at a spot salary owing to the nature of its employment.

The 122 Deputy Chief Officer posts were made up of posts at the following Grades:

- Grade J 913
- Grade I 2118
- Grade H 5143
- Grade G 1725
- Grade F 1921

plus five~~two~~ posts paid at spot salaries owing to the nature of their employment and/or funding.

49.48. The distinctions between SMG pay and payments made to employees on other Grades are outlined in the relevant sections of this Statement above. The most significant element of pay able to be received by employees in Grades A-J that is not available to SMG posts is market supplements. 97 Chief Officers in Grades H-I-J receive these payments as do 531 Deputy Chief Officers in Grades G-F-J. 42 of the Deputy Chief Officers in Grade F receive additional payments for working contractual hours in addition to the standard 35 per week on most City Corporation contracts. One Deputy Chief Officer on Grade F receives occasional additional payments for participating in electoral activities. One~~Two~~ Deputy Chief Officers (~~one on Grade G and one on~~ Grade J) receives s additional payments for undertaking standby duties.

50.49. In cash terms, the payments per annum made to Chief Officers (including those in the SMG) and Deputy Chief Officers fall into the following broad pay bands:

| <u>£ per annum</u> | <u>Chief Officers</u> | <u>Deputy Chief Officers</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| 40,000 – 50,000 | - | <u>178</u> |
| 51,000 – 60,000 | <u>-1</u> | <u>4225</u> |
| 61,000 – 70,000 | - | <u>3424</u> |
| 71,000 – 80,000 | <u>42</u> | <u>2115</u> |

| | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 81,000 – 90,000 | <u>24</u> | 143 |
| 91,000 – 100,000 | - | 12 |
| 101,000 – 110,000 | <u>24</u> | 6 |
| 111,000 – 120,000 | <u>64</u> | <u>32</u> |
| 121,000 – 140,000 | <u>65</u> | <u>53</u> |
| 141,000 – 160,000 | 4 | - |
| 161,000 – 199,000 | 5 | - |
| <u>200,000 – 255,00</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>1</u> |
| <u>Total employees</u> | <u>30</u> | <u>122</u> |

All payments outlined in the table above exclude London Weighting payments.

51-50. As mentioned earlier, the City Corporation is currently undertaking a significant review of its structure and services. This is due to be implemented this year, and it ~~may be likely that it will~~ have ~~some a wide~~ effect on the numbers and the remuneration of Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers employed.

52-51. The schemes for incremental pay increases and Contribution Payments for employees in Grades D-J and the Senior Management Grade are set out in the relevant sections of this Statement above. These apply to Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers, depending on whether they are in one of the D-J Grades or the SMG. No Chief Officer or Deputy Chief Officer has an element of their basic pay “at risk” to be earned back each year. Progression through Grades is, however, subject to successful performance, assessed through the application of the performance-appraisal scheme. Contribution Payments for any Chief Officer or Deputy Chief Officer are only available (when authorised) to those at the top of their Grades. These must also be earned through performance appraisal, and all such payments are non-consolidated, meaning that any recurrence of the payment has again to be earned through performance in future years.

53-52. The Act requires authorities to set out their policies on remuneration for their highest-paid staff alongside their policies towards their lowest-paid staff, and to explain what they think the relationship should be between the remuneration of their highest-paid staff and other staff. The City Corporation’s pay multiple - the ratio between the highest paid and lowest paid permanent staff - is approximately 1:112. The ratio between the pay of the highest paid member of staff and the median earnings figure for all staff in the authority is approximately 1:7.

Publication of information relating to remuneration

54-53. The City Corporation will publish details of positions with remuneration of £50,000 or above in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 and the Local Government Transparency Code issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

55-54. This Pay Policy Statement will be published on the Corporation’s public website. It may be amended at any time during 2021-2022 by resolution of the Court of Common Council. Any amendments will also be published on the Corporation’s public website.

~~56-55.~~ This statement meets the requirements of the: Localism Act 2011; the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) guidance on “Openness and accountability in local pay: Guidance under section 40 of the Localism Act” (including any supplementary Guidance issued); “The Local Government Transparency Code 2015”; and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.

~~57-56.~~ From 2018, the City of London Corporation is required under the Equality Act 2010 to publish information every year showing the pay gap between male and female employees. The organisation’s most recent such report was published in March 2020, and showed a diminution in the mean and median hourly-rate gender pay gap and an increase in the proportion of women in the upper quartile of employees by pay rates.

~~T. Graham~~
~~C. E. Lord, OBE JP~~
Chair, Establishment Committee

~~C. E. Lord, OBE JP~~
~~T. Graham~~
Deputy Chair, Establishment Committee

~~November~~
~~February~~ 2021

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|---|--|
| | Dates: |
| Board of Governors of the City of London School Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls Policy and Resources Committee Court of Common Council | 8 December 2021 10 December 2021 16 December 2021 13 January 2022 |
| Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly? | 3, 4, 8, 10 |
| Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending? | N/A |
| 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? | N/A |
| Subject: City Junior School Governance structure | Public |
| Report of: The Head, City of London School The Head, City of London School for Girls | For Decision |
| Report authors: Charles Griffiths, Bursar, City Junior School | |

Summary

At present the proposed City Junior School (CJS) project is governed jointly by the Boards of both the City of London School for Girls (CLSG) and City of London School (CLS), although both Schools have agreed to establish an informal working group titled ‘Project EDWIN committee’ to discuss operational matters relating to City Junior School.

Following officer and member discussions with respect to the optimal governance structure for CJS, and having regard to on-going work relating to the City of London Corporation’s wider governance review, the Boards of CLSG and CLS request that CJS be governed by a sub-committee equally made up of members of CLS and CLSG’s Boards of Governors, incorporating both Members and co-opted Governors.

This sub-committee will fulfil the normal duties of a school’s Board of Governors and operate in accordance with the terms of reference detailed in the attached appendices. This report provides a draft for the Terms of Reference for a proposed sub-committee acting as the Board of Governors of the City Junior School for decision.

Recommendations

The Boards of Governors of the City of London School and City of London School for Girls and the Policy and Resources Committee are invited to:

- Agree in principle to the creation of a sub-committee to undertake the duties of the Board of Governors of the City Junior School;
- Agree to the draft Terms of Reference as detailed in Appendix 3; and

- Agree the respective revised Terms of Reference of the Board of Governors of the City of London School and Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls, which includes the oversight of the City Junior School.

The Boards of Governors of the City of London School for Girls and the City of London School are invited to:

- Agree the appointment from each of the Boards of Governors of CLSG and CLS of up to two Common Councillor Governors, one Co-opted Governor, and the Chairs of the Board of Governors (as ex-officio Governors).

Main Report

Main Report

1. A co-educational junior school operated jointly by CLS and CLSG and acting as a feeder school for both senior schools, is being developed on a site in Gray's Inn. Finances have been agreed among various committees and the City Surveyor's Department has worked with the landlord at Gray's Inn to secure a lease on a former educational facility which is available for long-term lease. The Heads of Terms have been approved by the Court of Common Council. The lease commenced from September 2021 and the School will open for pupils from September 2022. The initial announcement of the school's opening was made by CLS and CLSG on 12 May 2021 to allow the admissions process to begin. The admissions process is progressing well, and the project overall is on schedule.
2. To date all significant decisions have been made jointly by reporting separately to the Boards of Governors of CLS and CLSG, however this governance structure is too onerous and unwieldy as the junior school project progresses. Once the junior school is open and operational, it will also require a stable governance and leadership structure that is able to meet its individual needs and show the necessary level of detailed oversight for external inspection.
3. Following consultation with the Boards of CLSG and CLS, the Town Clerk, Comptroller and City Solicitors, and the previous decision of Policy and Resources Committee in June 2021 it is proposed that CJS's governance comprises a sub-committee jointly of the Board of Governors of CLSG and the Board of Governors of CLS. It is additionally proposed that this sub-committee be designated as the 'Board of Governors of the City Junior School' and operate according to the term of reference outlined in appendix 3.
4. City Junior School is expected to develop into a significant school with 300 pupils on its own site, which will require a separate Department for Education (DfE) license and can be expected to be subject to Independent Schools Inspectorate (ISI) inspection in its own right. As such the ISI will require a clear and accountable, independent governance structure for the junior school. At the same time City Junior School will be linked to both CLS and CLSG financially, operationally and in feeding pupils to the senior schools. As such the terms of reference of the Board of City Junior School should reflect both this linkage to the two senior schools while offering operational independence.

5. It is noted that the City of London is undertaking a governance review which includes a strategic target of limiting unnecessary growth in the number of grand committees. To accommodate this strategy while meeting CJS's governance requirement it is proposed that CJS's Board of Governors be established as a sub-committee of CLSG's and CLS's Boards of Governors, made up of a majority of Common Councilors with voting rights, and complemented by a number of external, co-opted Governors also with voting rights, bringing additional skills relevant to an independent junior school. The Sub-committee's/Board's terms of reference would cover all School matters, but given the School's establishment as a satellite of CLS and CLSG, and reliance on these two senior schools as a financial backstop, certain governance matters would be reserved for the Boards of CLS and CLSG. These would include matters relating to (i) City Junior School financial strategy and budget, which might have a material impact on the finances of CLS or CLSG, (ii) membership of the City Junior School Board of Governors, and (iii) other matters which might have a significant impact on CLSG and CLS.
6. The members of the Board of Governors of the City Junior School would be selected by CLSG and CLS Board of Governors (3 appointments each). The Chair and Deputy Chair to then be appointed from and by the Board of Governors of the City Junior School. The Board will also include co-opted governors with specialist experience relevant to the needs of the school. Details of the terms of reference for CLSG and CLS are set out in the appendices, and in appendix 3 a draft of the proposed terms of reference for the City Junior School are also set out.

Options

7. Members may choose to either: recommend the creation of a new decision making body that is able to take ownership of governance on behalf of the City Junior School; or, leave governance arrangements as they are (i.e. all matters to be reported separately to both the Board of Governors of CLS and CLSG).
8. If agreed, it is recommended that the revisions to the Terms of Reference of the Board of Governors of CLS and CLSG, to reflect their oversight of City Junior School (as proposed in Appendices 1 and 2), be submitted for approval also. Proposed additions have been underlined.

Proposal(s)

9. In light of the requirements of the ISI outlined above, it is recommended that a new decision-making, governing body be established for the City Junior School, in the form of a Sub-committee of the Boards of Governors of CLSG and CLS jointly.

Corporate & Strategic Implications - None

Financial and resource implications - Financing for CJS has been agreed via a loan from the City. It is acknowledged that there will be resource implications for

the Town Clerk's Department as a separate Sub-committee is being proposed and will need to be supported accordingly. Other resource implications include the need to staff the junior school's leadership and governance structure, which is currently being handled by CLSG and CLS staff, but in due course will be separately resourced and budgets have been agreed for this.

Legal implications – The Corporation has the necessary powers, in its private "City's Cash" capacity, to establish the junior school and to determine its governance arrangements.

Risk implications – these have been noted in previous Board papers and largely comprise risks associated with expanding CLSG's existing junior school on a new site.

Equalities implications - None

Climate implications – City Surveyors are undertaking the building works in-line with the necessary environmental considerations.

Security implications - None

10. **Conclusion** – Governors and Members are asked to consider this report and agree to the proposed establishment of the City Junior School Board of Governors as a sub-committee and based on the terms of reference detailed in appendix 3.

Appendix 1 – CLS Board of Governors Terms of Reference

Appendix 2 – CLSG Board of Governors Terms of Reference

Appendix 3 – Proposed City Junior School Draft Terms of Reference

Contacts

Charles Griffiths
Bursar, City Junior School
E: c.griffiths@cityjuniorschool.org.uk

Terms of Reference for the Board of Governors of the City of London School

1. **Constitution**

A Non-Ward Committee consisting of,

- one Alderman nominated by the Court of Aldermen
- up to 10 Commoners elected by the Court of Common Council at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment
- the following ex-officio Members:-
 - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London School for Girls
 - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London Freeman's School
- up to eight co-opted non-City of London Corporation Governors with experience relevant to the Board

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

2. **Quorum**

The quorum consists of any five Common Council Governors.

Any decision taken by the Board of Governors shall require the agreement of a majority of Common Council Governors present at the meeting and voting.

3. **Membership (until July 2021)**

ALDERMEN

5 Vincent Thomas Keaveny

COMMONERS

Alexander Robertson Martin Barr

Keith David Forbes Bottomley, Deputy

Timothy Levene

Edward Lord, O.B.E., J.P., Deputy

Ian Christopher Norman Seaton

James Michael Douglas Thomson, Deputy

Marianne Bernadette Fredericks

Dominic Gerard Christian

(Caroline Wilma Haines)

together with:-

Lesley Cartmell

Rosie Gill

(John Claughton)

Andrew Jones

Ronel Lehmann

(Lord Levene of Portsoken)

Paul Madden

Timi Dorgu

Vacancy

together with four Members to be appointed this day and the ex-officio Members referred to in paragraph 1 above.

4. Terms of Reference

To be responsible for:-

- (a) all School matters;
- (b) the management of the School land and buildings belonging to the City of London Corporation;
- (c) the appointment of the Head and, where appropriate, the deputies and the Bursar; and
- (d) oversight of the policy, strategic and financial management of the City Junior School.

Terms of Reference for the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls

1. Constitution

A Non-Ward Committee consisting of,

- up to two Aldermen nominated by the Court of Aldermen
- up to 12 Commoners elected by the Court of Common Council at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment
- the following ex-officio Members:-
 - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London School
 - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London Freeman's School
- up to six co-opted non-City of London Corporation Governors with experience relevant to the Board

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

2. Quorum

The quorum consists of any five Common Council Governors.

Any decision taken by the Board of Governors shall require the agreement of a majority of Common Council Governors present at the meeting and voting.

3. Membership (until July 2021)

ALDERMEN

Robert Howard

Prem Goyal, O.B.E., J.P.

COMMONERS

Mary Durcan *for two years*

Clare James, Deputy

Dhruv Patel, O.B.E., *for three years*

Peter Gordon Bennett *for three years*

Mark Bostock *for three years*

Nicholas Michael Bensted-Smith, J.P.

Randall Keith Anderson

Tom Hoffman, M.B.E., Deputy

Rehana Banu Ameer
Shravan Jashvantrai Joshi
Richard David Regan, O.B.E., Deputy

together with :-

Prof. Anna Abulafia
Dr. Stephanie Ellington
Mary Ireland
Elizabeth Phillips
Vacancy
Vacancy

together with the ex-officio Members referred to in paragraph 1 above and four Members to be appointed this day.

4. Terms of Reference

To be responsible for:-

- (a) all School matters;
- (b) the management of the School land and buildings belonging to the City of London Corporation;
- (c) the appointment of the Head and, where appropriate, the deputies and the bursar; and
- (d) oversight of the policy, strategic and financial management of the City Junior School.

Proposed Terms of Reference for the City Junior School

1. Constitution

A Non-Ward sub-committee jointly of the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls and the Board of Governors of the City of London School consisting of up to 11 Governors, comprising

- up to 2 Members of the Court of Common Council elected from and by the Board of Governors of the City of London School
- up to 2 Members of the Court of Common Council elected from and by the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls
- the following ex-officio Members:-
 - the Chair of the Board of Governors of City of London School
 - the Chair of the Board of Governors of City of London School for Girls
- up to 2 co-opted non-City of London Corporation Governors with experience relevant to the Board, 1 co-opted from each of the Boards of City of London School for Girls and City of London School.
- up to 3 external members as co-opted non-City of London Corporation Governors with experience relevant to the Board.

The Chair and Deputy Chair shall be elected by the membership of the Board but the Chair of the Boards of Governors of the City of London School for Girls and the City of London School shall not be eligible to act as Chair of this sub-committee. Only Governors from the Court of Common Council Members will be eligible to serve as Chair and only co-opted non-City of London Corporation Governors can act as Deputy Chair.

All Governors will have voting rights.

2. Quorum

The quorum consists of any three Common Council Governors and one External Governor; at least one of whom must be an elected representative of the Board of Governors of the City of London School and another one of whom must be an elected representative of the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls.

Any decision taken by the Board of Governors shall require the agreement of a majority of Common Council Governors present at the meeting and voting.

4. Terms of Reference

To be responsible for:-

- (a) all School matters, with the exception of matters relating to

- (i) City Junior School financial strategy and budgets, which might have a material impact on the finances of CLS or CLSG;
 - (ii) membership of this Board of Governors; and
 - (iii) significant strategic importance;
- which must all be signed off by the Board of Governors of the City of London School and the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls.
- (b) the management of the School land and buildings belonging to the City of London Corporation;
 - (e) the appointment of the Head and, where appropriate, the deputies and the bursar.

Agenda Item 8

| | |
|--|--|
| Committee(s) | Dated: |
| Resource Allocation Sub Committee Bridge House Estates Board Finance Committee Policy & Resources Committee | 19 November 2021 24 November 2021 7 December 2021 16 December 2021 |
| Subject: Capital Funding – Prioritisation of 2022/23 Annual Capital Bids - Initial Review | Public |
| Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly? | These capital bids span all 12 outcomes of the Corporate Plan to some degree |
| Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending? | No decisions about specific commitments are required at this stage |
| If so, how much? | £ |
| What is the source of Funding? | All <u>central</u> funding sources of the three main funds could be impacted |
| Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department? | |
| Report of: The Chamberlain | For Decision |
| Report author: Dianne Merrifield, Group Accountant (Capital) | |

Summary

In this third annual capital bid round, there are 47 live bids amounting to **£61.9m**. Most of the submissions have been classified as essential and identified against one of the agreed prioritisation criteria. Based on the narrative supporting the bids, an assessment of how essential these schemes appear from a corporate perspective has been undertaken using a RAG rating approach - resulting in £24.3m green, £29.3m amber and £8.4m red.

To set these bids in to some context, £89m of capital bids were originally approved in principle via the 2020/21 annual capital bid process and £83.5m via the 2021/22 bid round. However, these annual levels of bids were considered to be exceptional and unsustainable on an ongoing basis alongside the other current financial priorities and pressures such as the major projects and balancing of the revenue budgets.

Accordingly, through discussions at the Resource Allocation Sub Committee Awayday, the following upper limits of funding for new bids was proposed for City Fund and City’s Cash:

- £20m for City Fund (incorporating bids to be funded from the On-Street Parking Reserve, Community Infrastructure Levy and central capital/revenue reserves)
- £10m for City’s Cash from general reserves.

This level of funding is broadly in line with the average level of centrally funded schemes over previous years.

The Bridge House Estates funding requirement for these centrally funded schemes is limited to the appropriate share of corporate IT and Guildhall office-related projects and therefore the amounts involved are usually relatively modest.

The initial assessment, which has been determined in consultation with senior officers, has resulted in the current level of green bids, at £24.3m, falling within these limits. Subject to feedback from Members and providing those bids remain within the £30m overall limits, it is therefore proposed that funding for the green bids be approved in principle for 2022/23, to be incorporated into the medium-term financial plans. It is further proposed that amber and red bids are not funded in this annual round, but with amber bids to be placed on a reserve list in the event that headroom in the provisions for green bids is identified.

For Bridge House Estates, the total share of corporate schemes rated as green amounts to £0.1m, which can be accommodated from the balances on the unrestricted income fund. These schemes have senior officer and member oversight and will be taken to the November BHE Board for approval including any updates from this meeting.

Post RASC addendum: At the meeting of RASC on 19th November, delegated authority to consider options for reduced 2022/23 central funding allocations for one amber-rated and one red-rated scheme were agreed:

- St Paul's Gyrotory
- St Paul's Cathedral Lighting

It was agreed that officers go away and come back with a revised bid for Walbrook Wharf feasibility.

The draft minute from RASC is added as an appendix .

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Note the total value of City Fund and City's Cash bids amounting to £61.9m against a target upper limit of £30m (excl BHE).
- Review the initial RAG rating of £24.3m green, £29.3m amber and £8.4m red contained in the appendices (determined in consultation with senior officers).
- Agree that, subject to Member feedback, funding for the green bids be incorporated into the medium-term financial plans, providing they remain within the £30m overall limits for City Fund and City's Cash and remain at a similar modest level for Bridge House.
- Agree in principle that bids with a final RAG rating of amber and red be deferred, subject to further consideration of reduced funding options for the three schemes highlighted in the RASC draft minute (see appendix.)

- Agree that amber-rated bids be placed on a reserve list to be progressed in the event that funding headroom is identified.
- Note that the final decision on the green-rated bids for inclusion in the 2022/23 draft budgets will be confirmed at the joint meeting of RASC and the service committee and Bridge House Estates Board chairmen in January 2022.

Main Report

Background

1. Members have agreed the necessity for effective prioritisation of capital and SRP projects, with central funding allocated in a measured way via the annual capital bid process by applying prioritisation criteria to ensure that corporate objectives are met and schemes are affordable.
2. The following criteria against which capital and supplementary revenue projects are assessed have been agreed:
 - i. Must be an essential scheme (Health and Safety or Statutory Compliance, Fully/substantially reimbursable, Major Renewal of Income Generating Asset, Spend to Save with a payback period < 5 years.)
 - ii. Must address a risk on the Corporate Risk register; or the following items that would otherwise be escalated to the corporate risk register:
 - a. Replacement of critical end of life components for core services;
 - b. Schemes required to deliver high priority policies; and
 - c. Schemes with a high reputational impact.
 - iii. Must have a sound business case, clearly demonstrating the negative impact of the scheme not going ahead, i.e. penalty costs or loss of income, where these are material.

In addition, bids in support of the Climate Action Strategy are to be allowed a degree of priority, subject to affordability.

3. The scope of schemes subject to this prioritisation relates only to those funded from central sources, which include the On-Street Parking Reserve, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), flexible external contributions and allocations from the general reserves of City Fund or City's Cash. This means that projects funded from most ring-fenced funds, such as the Housing Revenue Account, Designated Sales Pools and Cyclical Works Programmes are excluded, together with schemes wholly funded from external grants, and tenant/developer contributions e.g. under S278 agreements and most S106 deposits.
4. In view of the various current financial pressures arising from the pandemic and other high priority initiatives, Chief Officers were requested to submit bids for only the most critical and essential schemes for the 2022/23 bid round.

Current Position

5. Departments have submitted their bids for central funding from 2022/23 which they consider necessary to deliver business plans. It should be noted that whilst these schemes are to be started during 2022/23, costs are anticipated to be incurred over the medium term as the lead-in time for projects mean that they routinely span across more than one financial year.

6. There are 47 live bids amounting to £61.9m, most of which have been classified as essential and identified against one of the agreed prioritisation criteria. Based on the narrative supporting the bids, an assessment of how essential these schemes appear from a corporate perspective has been undertaken using a RAG rating approach where:

Green = demonstrates the essential criteria

Amber = essential criteria less clear

Red = does not demonstrate essential criteria/not essential to do now.

7. The table below shows the outcome, with £24.3m green, £29.3m amber and £8.4m red.

| | Green | Amber | Red | Total |
|---|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| Critical End of Life Replacement | 5,280 | 10,030 | 3,065 | 18,375 |
| Statutory Compliance/Health and Safety | 7,784 | - | 2,774 | 10,558 |
| High Profile Policy Initiative | 11,236 | 19,120 | - | 30,356 |
| Other | - | 100 | 2,500 | 2,600 |
| | 24,300 | 29,250 | 8,339 | 61,889 |

Listings of the projects within each of the green, amber and red categories are attached in the appendix, together with a brief commentary on each to inform the red/amber/green rating.

8. This analysis has been determined in consultation with senior officers, with particular discussion around the amber and red rated bids to ensure consistency and consensus of approach. For example, during discussions the top-up bid for the Guildhall Masterplan feasibility (£1.15m) was moved to green as completion was considered essential to inform the potential of this major initiative, whilst the Hampstead Heath Pergola bid (£1.5m) was moved to red to reflect the proposed external funding approach.

Affordability

9. To set these bids in to some context, £89m of capital bids were approved in principle via the 2020/21 annual capital bid process and £83.5m via the 2021/22 bid round. However, bids of this magnitude were considered to be exceptional and unsustainable on an ongoing basis alongside the other current financial

priorities and pressures such as the major projects and balancing of the revenue budgets.

10. Accordingly, through discussions at Resource Allocation Sub Committee Awayday, the following target allocations of funding for new bids was proposed:

- £20m for City Fund (incorporating bids to be funded from the On-Street Parking Reserve, Community Infrastructure Levy and central capital/revenue reserves
- £10m for City's Cash from general reserves.

11. In order to further assess affordability, bids have been identified against the relevant funding source as summarised below:

| | Green | Amber | Red | Total |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | £000 | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| City Fund: | | | | |
| -OSPR | 3,450 | 18,320 | 1,000 | 22,770 |
| -CIL | 7,533 | - | - | 7,533 |
| -Capital | 2,211 | 8,670 | 3,827 | 14,708 |
| -Revenue | 1,947 | 496 | - | 2,443 |
| City Fund | 15,141 | 27,486 | 4,827 | 47,454 |
| City's Cash | 9,044 | 1,670 | 3,487 | 14,201 |
| BHE | 115 | 94 | 25 | 234 |
| Total | 24,300 | 29,250 | 8,339 | 61,889 |

12. The following analysis shows the level of green bids against the individual target funding allocations:

| | Funding Targets | Green Bids | Headroom |
|--------------------|-----------------|------------|----------|
| | £000 | £000 | £000 |
| City Fund | 20,000 | 15,141 | 4,859 |
| City's Cash | 10,000 | 9,044 | 956 |
| BHE | N/A | 115 | N/A |
| | 30,000 | 24,300 | 5,815 |

This headroom allows a degree of flexibility to take on board Member feedback and comments arising from the joint meeting of RASC and service committee chairmen, or other urgent needs that may arise in 2022/23.

13. As a consequence, it is therefore proposed that bids with a final RAG rating of amber and red will not be funded at this time, although amber schemes will be placed on a reserve list, to be progressed in the event that funding headroom is identified.

14. Bridge House Estates funding towards these centrally funded schemes is limited to the appropriate share of corporate IT and Guildhall office-related projects and therefore the amounts involved are usually relatively modest. The total share of such corporate, green-rated bids amounts to £0.1m, which

can be accommodated from the balances on the unrestricted income fund following approval by Bridge House Estates Board.

Next Steps

15. Based on the current assessment, it is proposed that the green bids be modelled in the draft medium term financial plans to inform the 2022/23 budget proposals (Amber and red bids to be deferred).
16. Next steps will be to take on board member feedback with confirmation of the green-rated bids via the joint meeting of RASC and service committee and Bridge House Board chairman in January 2022

Conclusion

17. In this third annual capital bid round, there are 47 live bids amounting to **£61.9m**. Most of the submissions have been classified as essential and identified against one of the agreed prioritisation criteria. Based on the narrative supporting the bids, an assessment of how essential these schemes appear from a corporate perspective has been undertaken using a RAG rating approach - resulting in £24.3m green, £29.3m amber and £8.4m red.
18. A target allocation of £30m (£20m City Fund and £10m City's Cash) for the 2022/23 capital bids was agreed at the Resource Allocation Sub Committee Awayday. At £24.3m, the current level of green rated bids falls within these limits, also allowing a degree of flexibility to take on board Member feedback and comments arising from the joint meeting of RASC and service committee chairmen.
19. Recommendation bids with a final rating of amber and red will not be funded at this time, although the amber list schemes will be placed on a reserve list to be progressed in the event that any funding headroom is identified.

Report author

Dianne Merrifield
Group Accountant, Capital

E: dianne.merrifield@cityoflondon.gov.uk

T: contact via Teams whilst working from home

Appendices: Green/Amber/Red Bids
Draft Minute from RASC 19/11/21

2022/23 Annual Bids - Initial Assessment Green

| Project Name | City Fund £'m | City's Cash £'m | BHE £'m | Total Funding Allocation £'m |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| Critical end of life replacement: | | | | |
| BEMS Upgrade Phase 2 - Heathrow Animal Reception Centre and various OS sites at Epping | 0.150 | 0.100 | - | 0.250 |
| IT - Members IT refresh (to align with new personal device roll-out for staff) | 0.192 | 0.087 | 0.021 | 0.300 |
| IT - Managed Service re-provisioning (one-off costs due to end of current contract) | 0.320 | 0.145 | 0.035 | 0.500 |
| IT - Corporate Managed Print Service (one-off costs due to end of current contract) | 0.032 | 0.015 | 0.004 | 0.050 |
| IT - Server Upgrade/replacement | 0.064 | 0.029 | 0.007 | 0.100 |
| Mansion House - essential roof repairs | - | 0.330 | - | 0.330 |
| OS Hampstead Heath - Parliament Hill Athletics Track Resurfacing | - | 2.000 | - | 2.000 |
| Guildhall School - Repairs to roof, expansion joint repairs and drainage and water systems (subject to holistic approach for highwalks, Barbican and School) | - | 1.750 | - | 1.750 |
| Health and Safety/Statutory Compliance: | | | | |
| Fire Safety - Guildhall Complex Fire Stopping all basement and plant areas | 0.202 | 0.210 | 0.008 | 0.420 |
| Fire Safety - Baynard House Car Park Sprinklers Replacement (remaining floors) | 0.250 | - | - | 0.250 |
| Central Criminal Court: Cells Ventilation - Top-Up bid to meet full scope of statutory requirements. (£1m bid agreed in principle as part of the 2021/22 capital bid round.) | 1.000 | - | - | 1.000 |
| OS Epping Forest - COVID-19 Path Restoration Project | - | 0.250 | - | 0.250 |
| OS Queen's Park Play Area and Sandpit replacement of equipment | - | 0.055 | - | 0.055 |
| Barbican Centre - Replacement of Central Battery Units for Emergency Lighting system | 0.280 | - | - | 0.280 |
| Guildhall School - Rigging infrastructures in Milton Court Concert Hall | - | 0.460 | - | 0.460 |
| Guildhall School - Safe technical access and working at height - Silk Street Theatre | - | 0.345 | - | 0.345 |
| Smithfield Market - Glass Canopy Overhaul | - | 0.300 | - | 0.300 |
| Smithfield Market - East Poultry Avenue Canopy Repairs and Remedial Works | - | 0.600 | - | 0.600 |
| Smithfield Car Park - Ceiling Coating and Damp Works | - | 1.050 | - | 1.050 |
| Beech Street Transportation and Public Realm project top-up to deliver permanent air quality and associated public realm improvements following successful experiment. | 2.500 | - | - | 2.500 |
| DCCS - Social Care Case Management System | 0.144 | - | - | 0.144 |
| IT - Building Management System Wired Network to maximise efficiencies of new BEMS systems | 0.083 | 0.038 | 0.009 | 0.130 |
| High Priority Policy: | | | | |
| Secure City Programme - Year 3 | 8.936 | - | - | 8.936 |
| IT Security | 0.128 | 0.058 | 0.014 | 0.200 |
| Guildhall Complex Masterplan - Redevelopment of North and West Wing Offices (top-up) | - | 1.150 | - | 1.150 |
| Bank Junction Improvements: All Change at Bank - top-up to cover inflation risk of delivering the minimal scheme | 0.700 | - | - | 0.700 |
| IT - HR System Portal required in advance of the new ERP system delivery | 0.160 | 0.073 | 0.017 | 0.250 |
| Total Green Funding Bids | 15.141 | 9.044 | 0.115 | 24.300 |

Total 27 (of 47)

This page is intentionally left blank

Extracted Minute from Resource Allocation Sub-Committee – November 2021

6. CAPITAL FUNDING - PRIORITISATION OF 2022/23 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS - INITIAL REVIEW

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding an initial review Capital Funding Prioritisation of 2022/23 Annual Capital Bids.

Members were informed that Senior Officers had debated and prioritised the bids into a traffic light system of Green (demonstrates the essential criteria), Amber (essential criteria less clear) and Red (does not demonstrate essential criteria/not essential to do now). The list had already been challenged by the Chair and Deputy Chairman who made some adjustments.

Members considered the proposed Green/Amber/Red Bids and approved them all. The following comments were made on individual bids on the Amber and Red lists:

- **Barbican Centre - Repairs to roof, expansion joint repairs and drainage and water systems** – it was felt a holistic approach to all works at the Centre, including the podium and the Renewal Project, was needed. Members were happy for Officers to take additional time to explore this.
- **DCCS - Library Management System** – it was hoped a plan would be developed to maximise a single management system.
- **Walbrook Wharf Feasibility Study - 2027 & beyond** – this project was considered too premature to be Green. The Corporate Property Group Director felt it was deceptive to refer to the project post-2027 as Officers hoped to be ready with planning consent, a waste management system decision and aspiration to introduce rivers by 2027 at the latest. A plea was made to the Sub-Committee for some funding to be made available to move the project forward.

The Deputy Chairman, after having discussions with the Chair for CASC, thought it unlikely to incur increased costs if the project was delayed for a year, and Members were content provided it was Green by next year.

In response to queries, it was confirmed this was to cover a number of key decisions, cap projects and surveys which required strategic direction. Officers agreed to come back to the Sub-Committee with a revised bid.

- **IT - Data Repository/Warehouse** – a Member noted the complexity of the subject and felt it would be helpful to invite Officers involved in individual projects to provide the Sub-Committee with relevant information, as often Members were only aware of issues and implications if the project fell within their own committee areas.

An Officer confirmed IT issues had been included within the TOM process and focus was given to what has to happen rather than what would be nice to happen. Officers agree to invite Chief Officers to the meeting considering Amber and Red projects.

- **Guildhall Complex Post Covid New Ways of Working - Stage 2 works and furniture** – Members acknowledged the difficulties as it was not yet clear where to aim. Officers

confirmed the project had begun looking and the North and West of Guildhall, and clear direction on the shape of the project was still needed.

- **St Paul's Gyrotory** – the Chair read comments received in advance of the meeting from a Member who asked if a) Officers could split out the different elements of the Gyrotory project to get clarity on what costs and timeline for realisation is of each element; b) endorsement of the recommendation that a “minimal allocation to fund investigations to inform the central funding requirement” is approved to be signed off under delegated authority to ensure the process progresses whilst not yet moving into Green for 2022/23, and c) instruct Officers to engage with developers of 81 Newgate Street and other local projects to get clearer understanding of the level of their financial contributions to improvements to the public realm. Members and Officers were supportive of the suggestions and approved the delegated authority.
- **St Paul's Cathedral Re-Lighting** – a Member noted that there were a number of upcoming important anniversaries plus other events with St Paul's at the heart of national events. Currently, half of the dome was not lit and there were general health and safety concerns. The Member asked if this could be considered as a Capital Bid, subject to necessary conditions, e.g. that it be made clear the revenue costs for lighting be borne from revenue at the Cathedral.

The Chair declared an interest in St Paul's noting that she sat on the Cathedral's Council.

Members discussed the informal agreement and questioned what the City Corporation's responsibilities were, the S106 obligations and why the Cathedral were not financing the costs as it was not a Corporation owned building and the Cathedral had its own funding stream. It was also noted that there were other funding options available including bids to the National Lottery Heritage Fund.

A Member advised that St Paul's had struggled during lockdown and was only back to 40% of donations experienced pre-pandemic. The Member also noted that the Corporation received a secondary income from people visiting the Cathedral.

Members were concerned by the vagueness of the agreement and the potential for the Corporation taking on responsibility for something that was not theirs. Whilst this was regarded as a good cause, Members felt that the project provided a luxury item for St Paul's and was not considered to be a sufficient responsibility to the City Corporation. Members requested more clarity, including the process for the potential S106 agreement and whether this should come from City's Fund when this was a private property, and were happy to put the bid on hold until this was provided.

It was agreed a fully thought out plan with conditions was needed and Members agreed to give delegated authority to progress this work pending further information. Officers agreed to provide a report providing more detail and place the bid in a separate waiting room.

- **IT tech bids** - A Member observed that all tech funding bids were not capital bids. Officers confirmed this was an ongoing issue with IT being addressed by the TOM and required more investigative working. This would be changed later.
- **Hampstead Heath Pergola Oak Structures repair and replacement** – Members were informed that there were opportunities for fundraising at this high-profile site and lots more

that could be done including weddings. A Member requested that funding opportunities be revisited and that the City Corporation do more to support all fundraising opportunities and outreach.

RESOLVED, that Members: -

- Note the total value of City Fund and City's Cash bids amounting to £61.9m against a target upper limit of £30m (excl BHE);
- Review the initial RAG rating of £24.3m green, £29.3m amber and £8.4m red contained in the appendices (determined in consultation with senior officers);
- Agree that, subject to Member feedback, funding for the green bids be incorporated into the medium-term financial plans, providing they remain within the £30m overall limits for City Fund and City's Cash and remain at a similar modest level for Bridge House;
- Agree in principle that bids with a final RAG rating of amber and red be deferred;
- Agree that amber-rated bids be placed on a reserve list to be progressed in the event that funding headroom is identified;
- Note that the final decision on the green-rated bids for inclusion in the 2022/23 draft budgets will be confirmed at the joint meeting of RASC and the service committee and Bridge House Estates Board chairmen in January 2022;
- Agree that a minimal allocation to fund investigations to inform the central funding requirement for the St Paul's Gyratory is approved under delegated authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to ensure the process continues to progress;
- Agree that delegated authority be given to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to allow Officers to progress with work concerning St Paul's Cathedral Re-Lighting and explore options in more detail to present to Members whilst the bid is placed in a separate waiting room.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 10

| | |
|---|---|
| Committee(s): Policy and Resources – For Information | [Meeting Date] 16 December 2021 |
| Subject: Policy and Resources Contingency/Discretionary Funds | Public |
| Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly? | All |
| Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending? | N |
| If so, how much? | £0 |
| Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department? | N/A |
| Report of: Chamberlain | For information |
| Report author: Laura Tuckey - Chamberlain | |

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 and COVID19 Contingency Fund for 2021/22 and future years with details of expenditure in 2021/22. The balances remaining for these Funds for 2021/22 and beyond are shown in the Table below. There are no new bids reported in this report since the last update.

| Fund | 2021/22 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids £ | 2022/23 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids £ | 2023/24 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids £ | 2024/25 Balance Remaining after Approved Bids £ |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Policy Initiative Fund | 447,307 | 687,000 | 717,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Policy and Resources Contingency | 210,719 | 285,000 | 285,000 | 285,000 |
| Policy & Resources Project Reserve | 343,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| COVID19 Contingency | 872,546 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Recommendation(s)

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. The initial amount transferred to this reserve totalled £450,000 from the Project Sub Committee, this 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.

Current Position

1. 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) has either been approved by the Town Clerk and Chamberlain under delegated authority or by this Committee.
2. The balances that are currently available in the Policy Initiatives Fund, Committee Contingency Fund, Committee's Project Reserve and COVID Contingency for 2021/22 are shown in the Table below.

| Fund | 2021/22 Opening Balance £ | 2021/22 Approved Bids £ | 2021/22 Balance Remaining after 2021/22 Approved Bids £ | 2021/22 Pending Bids £ | 2021/22 Balance Remaining after 2021/22 Pending Bids £ |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Policy Initiative Fund | 2,004,555 | (1,557,248) | 447,307 | 0 | 447,307 |
| Policy and Resources Contingency | 684,214 | (473,495) | 210,719 | 0 | 210,719 |
| Policy and Resources Project Reserve | 353,578 | (10,578) | 343,000 | 0 | 343,000 |
| COVID19 Contingency | 1,579,546 | (707,000) | 872,546 | 0 | 872,546 |

3. 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.

| | 2021/22 | 2022/23 | 2023/24 |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| Balance remaining of Multiyear PIF allocation | £0 | £87,000 | £117,000 |

Corporate & Strategic Implications

4. Strategic implications – 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.

5. Financial implications – 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
6. Resource implications – None
7. Legal implications – None
8. Risk implications – None
9. Equalities implications – None
10. Climate implications – None
11. Security implications – None

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – PIF 2021/22 and Future Years
- Appendix 2 – P&R Contingency 2021/22 and Future Years
- Appendix 3 – P&R Project Reserve 2021/22
- Appendix 4 – COVID19 Contingency 2021/22

Laura Tuckey

Senior Accountant, Chamberlain

T: 020 7332 1761

E : laura.tuckey@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 2

Policy and Resources Committee - Contingency 2021/22 to 2023/24

| Budget | 2021/22 | | 2022/23 | 2023/24 | 2024/25 |
|--|------------------|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Initial Budget | £ 300,000 | | £ 300,000 | £ 300,000 | £ 300,000 |
| Uncommitted balance brought forward from 2020/21 | £ 719 | | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| Unspent balances deferred from 2020/21 | £ 383,495 | | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| Unspent balances in 2020/21 returned to Fund | £ - | | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| Revised Budget | £ 684,214 | | £ 300,000 | £ 300,000 | £ 300,000 |

| Date | Name | 2021/22 Bid | 2021/22 Actual | 2022/23 Bid | 2023/24 Bid | 2023/24 Bid |
|------------|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 08/05/2014 | City of London Scholarship - Anglo-Irish Literature | £ 19,850 | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| 17/11/2016 | Police Arboretum Memorial Fundraising Dinner | £ 30,000 | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| 20/02/2020 | Common Council Elections in March 2021 - funding a high-profile advertising campaign | £ 126,645 | £ 54,353 | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| 19/11/2020 | Census 2021 | £ 18,000 | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| 10/12/2020 | Electoral Registration Campaign Manager | £ 150,000 | £ 95,773 | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| Urgency | Smithfield Negotiations - Mediation Fees | £ 57,000 | £ - | £ - | £ - | £ - |
| Urgency | Lord Mayor's Show Arrangements | £ - | £ - | £ 15,000 | £ 15,000 | £ 15,000 |
| 14/10/2021 | Election Engagement Campaign | £ 72,000 | £ 3,411 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Total Allocations | £ 473,495 | £ 153,537 | £ 15,000 | £ 15,000 | £ 15,000 |
| | Balance Remaining | £ 210,719 | | £ 285,000 | £ 285,000 | £ 285,000 |

Bids for Committee's Approval: **16 December 2021**

| | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| - | - | - | - | - |
| - | - | - | - | - |
| Total Balance if pending bids are approved | £ 210,719 | £ 285,000 | £ 285,000 | £ 285,000 |

Policy and Resources Committee Project Reserve: 2021/22

| Budget | 2021/22 |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Initial Budget | £ 450,000 |
| Less: 2019/20 spend | -£ 30,000 |
| Less: 2020/21 spend | -£ 66,422 |
| Revised Budget | £ 353,578 |

| Date | Name | 2021/22 Bid | 2021/22 Actual |
|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 30/07/2020 | Project Management Academy | £ 10,578 | £ - |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Total Allocations | £ 10,578 | £ - |
| | Balance Remaining | £ 343,000 | |

Bids for Committee's Approval: **16 December 2021**

| | |
|---|------------------|
| - | - |
| - | - |
| Total Balance if pending bids are approved | £ 343,000 |

Policy & Resources Committee - COVID Contingency 2020/21 - 2021/22

| Budget | 2020/21 | 2021/22 |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| Initial Budget | £ 1,500,000 | |
| Funding moved from Brexit funding - City Fund | £ 239,270 | |
| Funding moved from Brexit Funding - City's Cash | £ 413,276 | |
| Uncommitted funding carried forward from 2020/21 - City Fund | | £ 85,000 |
| Uncommitted funding carried forward from 2020/21 - City's Cash | | £ 394,546 |
| Additional allocation ringfenced for GSMD subject to CCC approval | | £ 600,000 |
| Funding transferred from PIF & Finance Contingency | | £ 500,000 |
| Revised Budget | £ 2,152,546 | £ 1,579,546 |

| Date | Name | 2020/21 Bids | 2021/22 Bids |
|------------|---|--------------------|------------------|
| 03/04/2020 | SMTA Rates Bill | £ 67,000 | |
| 21/04/2020 | COLPAI - CCTV | £ 41,000 | |
| 17/04/2020 | Support the Mortality Management Group | £ 27,000 | |
| 24/04/2020 | Direct Access Server Replacement + Additional Server | £ 37,000 | |
| 06/05/2020 | PPE Purchasing | £ 4,000 | |
| 11/05/2020 | CoLP IT Resilience | £ 263,000 | |
| 28/05/2020 | Open Spaces PPE and HSE | £ 65,000 | |
| 09/06/2020 | Using Public Transport and Social Distancing - Face Coverings | £ 25,000 | |
| 24/06/2020 | CoLIT - Remote Working upgrades and expenses | £ 81,000 | |
| 09/07/2020 | City of London Academies Trust Funding Request for Summer Provision 2020/21 | £ 70,000 | |
| 08/07/2020 | Everyone In - Rough Sleeping Response | £ 261,000 | |
| 27/07/2020 | Brakespear Mortuary | £ 32,000 | £ 12,000 |
| 05/10/2020 | Public Health Communications Officer | £ 50,000 | |
| 19/11/2020 | Communications with Residents | £ 28,000 | |
| 10/12/2020 | Dedicated City Corporation News Hub on City AM | £ 45,000 | |
| 21/12/2020 | Dedicated strategic support on social care to the Chief Executive of Ealing | £ 9,000 | |
| 22/01/2021 | Letter drops to City residents | £ 24,000 | |
| 10/02/2021 | Public Health Communications Officer extended | | £ 40,000 |
| 18/03/2021 | Dedicated City Corporation News Hub on City AM | | £ 45,000 |
| 11/03/2021 | Recovery Promotional Campaign | | £ 250,000 |
| 19/03/2021 | Covering the cost of Hands-Face-Space COVID19 Campaign Materials | £ 13,000 | |
| 26/03/2021 | Contributions towards Pan London Mortality Wace 1 Costs | £ 16,000 | |
| 31/03/2021 | Mental Health & Well Being support to Academies | £ 320,000 | |
| 31/03/2021 | Laptops required for new starters and replacing broken devices | £ 195,000 | |
| 13/04/2021 | Temporary Communication sLead | | £ 40,000 |
| 13/04/2021 | Letter drops to Residents: May & June | | £ 16,000 |
| 08/06/2021 | Committee Meeting Live Streaming | | £ 68,000 |
| 01/07/2021 | Return to work costs | | £ 14,000 |
| 07/07/2021 | Mailing to city residents | | £ 8,000 |
| 05/08/2021 | Public Health Comms Officer | | £ 40,000 |
| 19/08/2021 | Phone licences | | £ 6,000 |
| 20/09/2021 | IT costs for home working | | £ 38,000 |
| 22/10/2021 | Culture Communications Officer | | £ 40,000 |
| 10/11/2021 | 65a Basinghall use as a Covid Test Centre | | £ 90,000 |
| | Total Allocations | £ 1,673,000 | £ 707,000 |
| | Non ringfenced balance (City's Cash) | | £ 272,546 |
| | Non ringfenced balance (City Fund) | | £ - |
| | GSMD ringfenced balance (City's Cash) | | £ 600,000 |
| | Total Balance Remaining | | £ 872,546 |

Bids pending Town Clerks Approval: 16 December 2021

Total Balance if pending bids are approved

£ 872,546

FROM: **PORT HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES COMMITTEE**
23 NOVEMBER 2021

TO: **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**
16 DECEMBER 2021

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT

Discharge of sewage into the Thames

Following significant recent media coverage, a Member was concerned by the discharge of sewage into the River Thames and requested an update to ensure the Committee understood what was happening.

Members were informed that the Thames Tideway Tunnel, the main scheme for central London, was already underway and would go some way to relieving the pressure on the Thames, but the latest estimate was that it would not be operational before 2025. It was also noted that Officers had provided evidence for the Thames in a recent study which included discharges into the river.

Members were advised that enforcement around sewage was not a PHES or City Corporation responsibility, it was the responsibility of the Environment Agency. Officers confirmed they had been in contact with the Environment Agency, who were also concerned, and it was recommended that the Committee express their concern over the Government's response by making a representation through the Policy & Resources Committee.

A Member noted that there had been media interest in whether the size of pipes of the Thames Tideway Tunnel would be sufficient in managing extreme rainfall and weather events in the future. Members were informed that the tunnel was based on previous projections prior to the ZSL study findings, and it was likely this would have an impact in the future.

In response to a query regarding whether there was any data on how often sewage was dumped into the Thames, Officers confirmed that the Environment Agency had relevant data on the number of discharges and the quantity which could be shared with Members.

Members expressed serious concern over the number of occasions on which raw sewage has been discharged into the River Thames and the devastating impact this could have on the biodiversity of the river. It was agreed that a formal resolution from the Committee go to the Policy & Resources Committee (P&R) expressing Member's concern and calling on P&R to make representations, as appropriate, to the relevant authorities calling for stricter controls over the discharge of sewage into natural waterways.

RESOLVED – That a resolution be made to the Policy & Resources Committee demonstrating the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee's concern regarding the discharge of sewage into the Thames and request for representations to the relevant authorities regarding the Government's response.

This page is intentionally left blank

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Committee(s) Policy & Resources Committee | Dated: 16/12/2021 |
| Subject: Decisions taken under delegated authority or urgency powers. | Public |
| Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly? | See Background Report |
| Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending? | See Background Report |
| If so, how much? | See Background Report |
| What is the source of Funding? | See Background Report |
| Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department? | See Background Report |
| Report of: Town Clerk | For Information |
| Report author: Chris Rumbles, Town Clerk’s Department | |

Summary

This report advises Members of actions taken by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, in accordance with Standing Order Nos. 41(a) and 41(b) since the last meeting.

Recommendation

That Members note the actions taken since the last meeting of the Committee.

Main Report

1. Since the last meeting of the Committee, approval has been given under urgency procedures or delegated authority arrangements, pursuant to Standing Order No. 41, as follows: -

Urgent Action: Markets Co-location Programme – Private Bill

Background: In March 2018, the Court of Common Council considered the outcomes of a review of the City’s current wholesale food markets, and it was agreed that in order for the markets to remain fit for purpose they needed to be relocated. A single-site solution was subsequently approved, and a decision was taken to co-locate the markets on the former site of the Barking Reach Power Station in Dagenham. It was also agreed that a Private Bill should be submitted to Parliament to effect the change.

Whilst a target date was originally set for the submission of the Bill for November 2020, for various reasons it had to be deferred, the latest deferral date being November 2021. In the lead up to the latest date, the City Corporation’s commitment to food wholesale markets has been revisited, including the possibility of refurbishing the existing buildings to prolong their life at the existing sites. Work has also been actively progressed to resolve other complex issues which have prevented the submission of a Bill within the previous time frame.

At its meeting in October 2021 the Court agreed to to submit a Private Bill to relocate the two markets most in need of better accommodation i.e., Smithfield and Billingsgate. The intention being to submit a further private bill to relocate New Spitalfields to Dagenham at a later date. However, if an agreement could not be reached with Smithfield, then it was agreed that a Private Bill should be pursued for Billingsgate only.

Subsequent discussions resulted in the progression of a Bill for Billingsgate only. Following last minute discussions about the terms of the support from Billingsgate traders, it was subsequently proposed that this Bill submission should also be delayed and that in the meantime work should continue with the traders towards a submission next year and that the already agreed repairs to the market be carried out in the shorter term.

A decision not to pursue a Private Bill for Billingsgate Fish Market in November 2021 needed to be taken urgently as the deadline for submitting a Bill such as this falls on one day each year.

An urgent decision was therefore sought and granted by the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee that:

- The Private Bill necessary to move Billingsgate Market to Dagenham Dock no longer be pursued in November 2021.
2. In accordance with Standing Order 41 (a) and 41 (b), Members are asked to note the recent decision taken by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman.
 3. Copies of background papers concerning these decisions are available from Chris Rumbles on request.

Contact:

Chris Rumbles

Christopher.rumbles@cityoflondon.gov.uk

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank