



Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee

Date: WEDNESDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 2021

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: VIRTUAL MEETING

Members: Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)
Jeremy Mayhew (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Tijs Broeke
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Karina Dostalova
Anne Fairweather
Sheriff Christopher Hayward
Shravan Joshi
Alderman Vincent Keaveny
Deputy Edward Lord
Alderman Ian Luder
Deputy Tom Sleigh
Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy James Thomson
Alderman Sir David Wootton

Enquiries: Emma Cunnington
emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

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

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yS7uE5apzk>

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

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **MINUTES**

To agree the public minutes of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 4 February 2021.

For Decision
(Pages 1 – 4)

4. **GOVERNANCE REVIEW: PLANNING**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 5 – 62)

5. **LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN – TRANSPORT FOR LONDON FUNDED SCHEMES 2020/21**

Report of the Director of Built Environment.

For Information
(Pages 63 – 66)

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

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

8. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

MOTION – That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

For Decision

Part 2 – Non-Public Agenda

9. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the non-public minutes of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 4 February 2021.

For Decision
(Pages 67 - 68)

10. **PROPERTY PROJECTS GROUP COVID19 CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND**

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Decision
(Pages 69 - 76)

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Thursday, 4 February 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at Virtual Meeting on Thursday, 4 February 2021 at 3.00 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)	Sheriff Christopher Hayward
Jeremy Mayhew (Deputy Chairman)	Shravan Joshi
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Alderman Vincent Keaveny
Tijs Broeke	Deputy Edward Lord
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark	Alderman Ian Luder
Karina Dostalova	Sir Michael Snyder
Anne Fairweather	Alderman Sir David Wootton

In Attendance

Marianne Fredericks
Barbara Newman

Officers:

Angela Roach	- Assistant Town Clerk & Director of Major Projects
Aqib Hussain	- IT
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Deputy Chamberlain
Dianne Merrifield	- Chamberlains
Emma Cunnington	- Town Clerks
Jack Joslin	- City Bridge Trust
John Barradell	- Town Clerk & Chief Executive
Leanne Murphy	- Town Clerks
Paul Wright	- Deputy Remembrancer
Peter Kane	- Chamberlain
Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk & Director of Major Projects
Devika Persaud	- Town Clerks

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received by Deputy Tom Sleigh.

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

There was one declaration:-

- Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark expressed an interest in item 4 by virtue of his role as Church Warden at St Lawrence Jewry.

3. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the joint meeting of this Sub Committee and the Efficiency and Performance Sub Committee held on 21 January 2021 were approved as a correct record.

4. **CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain concerning an update on Capital Funding.

Members heard how the request to draw down £196k of funding for the Interim Assessment Centre for Rough Sleepers would need to be deferred as the proposed site for the assessment centre was no longer available. The Department for Community and Children's Services were now looking for an alternative site and would be coming back through the gateways with a revised proposal in due course.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The following schemes be confirmed as continuing as essential priority for release of funding at this time:-
 - West Smithfield Area Public Realm and Transportation
 - London Metropolitan Archive (LMA) Replacement of Fire Alarm, Chillers and Landlord Lighting and Power
 - Walbrook Wharf Depot Replacement of Mechanical and Electrical Services
 - Computer Equipment Rooms Uninterrupted Power Supply
 - Critical IT Security Improvements
 - Golden Lane Estate Lighting and Accessibility Improvements
 - Baynard House Car Park Ventilation and Smoke Clearance System
 - Central Criminal Court East Wing Ground Mezzanine Cooling and Heating Replacement
 - St Lawrence Jewry Church
- The release of up to £6.887m from the relevant reserves of City Fund, City's Cash and Bridge House Estates as appropriate be agreed, subject to the required gateway and 2021/22 funding approvals.
- It be noted that in order to maintain sound financial discipline, a review of unallocated central project funding provisions will be brought to Members in the Spring.

5. **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 concerning the applications for approval in the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund.

A Member requested further detail on the reasoning behind the rejection of the Fleet Street Sundial project, and heard how the Central Grants Unit would work with the organisation to ensure the project had appropriate permission in place to submit a future application.

Members felt that the process had been slow for microgrants and suggested there should be delegation to ward grants. The Sub-Committee asked for another report on the matter to be submitted to this Sub-Committee in three months' time.

RESOLVED, that:-

- The approved and rejected grants under delegated authority at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in December 2020 be noted.
- The grant recommended to the Maggie Keswick Jencks Cancer Caring Centres Trust at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in December 2020 be approved.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

8. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

Item No.

9, 10

Paragraph No.

3

9. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

The non-public minutes of the joint meeting of the Sub-Committee and the Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee were approved as a correct record.

10. **CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME (CWP) AND ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR CITY FUND PROPERTIES (ARCFP)**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain concerning the Cyclical Works Programme (CWP) and Additional Resources for City Fund Properties (ARCFP).

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

There were no questions.

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

There was no other urgent business.

The meeting ended at 3.13 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Emma Cunnington
emma.cunnington@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Agenda Item 4

Committee:	Date:
Resource Allocation Sub-Committee	17 February 2021
Subject: Governance Review: Planning	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	4, 9, 10, 12
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: Town Clerk	For Decision
Report author: Greg Moore, Town Clerk's	

Summary

In September 2019, the Policy and Resources Committee, proposed the undertaking of a comprehensive Governance Review of the City Corporation. The Committee was conscious that some potentially contentious issues needed to be addressed and that some radical changes may need to be considered. It was, therefore, agreed that the review should be undertaken independently and Robert Rodgers, The Lord Lisvane, was appointed to conduct the Review.

Following the Review's submission, it was determined that the many proposals therein should be considered in a structured and methodical way in the coming period, with Members afforded sufficient time to read and consider the content and implications. It was noted that the recommendations were extensive, and it would be for Members to consider how far they were appropriate, and which should be taken forward. It was also agreed that it would be of the utmost importance to ensure that the process provided for all Members of the Court to continue to have the opportunity to input and comment on the Review.

To that end, a series of informal Member engagement sessions were arranged to afford all Members opportunities to express their views on the various aspects of the Review as they were considered. These would then be fed back to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee to help inform its initial consideration of specific items.

Engagement sessions have now been held in respect of Section 7 of the Lisvane Review, in relation to Planning. The discussions from those sessions are set out in the appendices to this report. Whilst all Members' views have been anonymised in accordance with normal practice, any endorsements of comments made by others are only recorded once in order to avoid repetition.

Members are now asked to consider the various proposals relating to Section 7 of the Lisvane Review, in the context of Members' observations and reflections at the various informal sessions.

Recommendations

That Members:-

- Consider the proposals in relation to Planning made by Lord Lisvane in Section 7 of his Review (Appendix 1).
- Note the feedback provided by Members through the informal engagement process (Appendix 2).
- Consider the various proposals, as set out in this report arising from Lord Lisvane's Review and the subsequent Member Engagement sessions and make recommendation on a way forward.

Main Report

Background

1. In September 2019, the Policy and Resources Committee, proposed the undertaking of a comprehensive Governance Review of the City Corporation. The Committee was conscious that some potentially contentious issues needed to be addressed and that some radical changes may need to be considered. It was, therefore, agreed that the review should be undertaken independently and Robert Rodgers, The Lord Lisvane, was appointed to conduct the Review.
2. The Committee received Lord Lisvane's Review in September 2020 and determined that the many proposals therein should be considered in a structured and methodical way in the coming period, with Members afforded sufficient time to read and consider the content and implications. It was noted that the recommendations were far-reaching and wide-ranging, and it would be for Members to consider how far they were appropriate, and which should be taken forward. It was also agreed that it would be of the utmost importance to ensure that the process provided for all Members of the Court to continue to have the opportunity to input and comment on the Review.
3. The Governance Review will affect all aspects of the City Corporation's governance and all Members as a consequence. It is, therefore, imperative that any implementation reflects the view of the Court, and it is likely that all Members will have views on particular elements. Their continued input remains integral and incorporating all Members' views within the next steps of the process will be vital in ensuring that the recommendations which are ultimately put to the Court are viable.
4. To that end, a series of informal Member engagement sessions were arranged to afford all Members opportunities to express their views on the various aspects of the Review as they are considered. These would then be fed back to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee to help inform its initial consideration of specific items.
5. The subject of the most recent engagement sessions has been Section 7 of the Governance Review, which looks at the City Corporation's Committee structures and systems. It touches on a variety of areas, including making recommendations on general themes on composition, reporting, minute style, etc., as well as the question of which Committees should exist in a new structure, and where methods of operation should be altered.
6. One of the areas of particular focus for this section concerns the Planning and Transportation Committee, which is broadly addressed in paragraphs 306 to 317 of Lisvane (although it should be noted that there are related comments or proposals elsewhere in Lisvane's report).
7. Following recent discussions in relation to the City Corporation's planning arrangements, the Policy & Resources Committee has determined that this particular sub-section of the Lisvane Review should be brought forward for discussion as a discrete item, with specific engagement sessions (rather than

part of the sessions on the committee structure more generally, as had been originally intended).

8. Views are now sought as to the various proposals put forward by Lisvane in relation to this Committee, their implications, and how they might be taken forward.

Lisvane's recommendations

9. The first substantive references in Lisvane to the Planning and Transportation Committee relate to its size (paragraph 269) and its status as a Ward Committee (paragraphs 270-272).
10. The former suggests that committees in general need to be reduced in terms of membership to between 12 and 15 Members, although in the particular case of Planning it is suggested that a slightly larger number may be needed in order to cope with the need to provide non-overlapping panels to consider applications. More detail / rationale on this, relating to the panel proposal, is provided at paragraph 309.
11. The latter recommendation, concerning Ward Committees, recommends the general abolition of Ward Committees as presently structured (i.e. a move away from committees with specific representation from each Ward).
12. The substantive recommendations relating to the Committee are set out at paragraphs 306-317. In summary, they propose a more strategic / policy framework-based approach, with greater consideration of applications by officers and thereby greater time afforded to the Committee to consider strategic, substantive or contentious issues. Lisvane also proposes a panel system to determine proposals, together with various other measures intended to mitigate against the perception of bias.

Lisvane Recommendations – Planning & Transportation Committee

13. Beginning at paragraph 306, Lisvane first alludes to the statutory functions of the Planning and Transportation Committee, which are set out at Appendix G of Lisvane (pages 157-158 in the full document). He suggests that these responsibilities should be retained, but with a reduced membership for the committee.
14. Paragraphs 307-308 propose a greater focus on strategy and policy frameworks, enabling officers to determine more applications within these confines and thus affording Members greater opportunity to focus on controversial or strategic matters. They also note the role of the Committee in coming to a dispassionate view based on agreed policy.
15. Paragraphs 309-310 propose the use of a “panel” system to consider applications, with membership drawn on an ad hoc basis from the full committee and excluding any Member whose ward is affected by the proposed application.

16. Paragraphs 311-316 deal with the perception of conflicts, whether that be in relation to the City Corporation's role or the role of individual Members.
17. Paragraph 312 notes the requirements of Regulation 10 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, which governs arrangements for taking decisions on planning applications.
18. Paragraphs 313-315 note the additional position set out by the Planning Protocol in relation to service on other City Corporation committees associated with planning applications. Firstly, Lisvane suggests that the current arrangement in relation to declaring service on other committees involved in applications is too lax and the non-requirement to make such a declaration should be amended / removed. He also adds that the current prohibition on affected Members voting should be extended to participation in debate.
19. At paragraph 316 Lisvane suggests that any Member serving on the proposed Property Committee (should Members determine to establish one) should not be eligible to serve on the Planning and Transportation Committee.
20. Finally, paragraph 317 recommends no change to the existing two sub-committees of the Planning and Transportation Committee.

Consideration

21. Three Member engagement sessions have been held in respect of this section of the report, the summary notes of which are appended to this report.
22. Members are now asked to give consideration to the various recommendations in the context of those discussions and the views expressed by Members of the Court. Pertinent considerations to work through include:
 - (i) ***Should the Planning & Transportation Committee continue to be a Ward Committee?***
 - (ii) ***Should the size of the Planning & Transportation Committee be reduced?***
 - (iii) ***Should the grand committee focus more on policy and strategy with the introduction of panels for consideration of applications?***
 - (iv) ***If so, how should Members be selected for such panels?***
 - (v) ***Should the two existing sub-committees continue as they are currently?***
 - (vi) ***Should Members be able to discuss and/or vote on items relating to their wards?***
 - (vii) ***Should Aldermen have appointment to the committee?***

- (viii) ***Should Members be prohibited from serving on both the Planning & Transportation Committee and Property Investment Board?***
- (ix) ***Should Members with professional connections or a background or expertise in property serve on the Committee?***
- (x) ***Should training be mandatory for Members of the committee?***
- (xi) ***What more can be done to increase the perception of transparency and mitigate against potential conflicts?***

Conclusion

23. Various proposals have been made by Lord Lisvane in relation to Planning, in Section 7 of his Review. Members are now required to consider his proposals and the attendant implications of any decisions, summarised above and set out in the Review. Consideration should be given to the views of all Members, made through the informal engagement process and set out in the appendices to this report, when reaching a position.
24. It is intended that any recommendations, subject to points of qualification or clarification, are put to the Policy & Resources Committee for further consideration. Thereafter, proposals are to be submitted to the Court of Common Council at its April 2021 meeting, to facilitate the finalisation and implementation of any new arrangements.

Appendices:

- **Appendix 1:** Extract - Governance Review Section 7, Planning.
- **Appendix 2:** Notes from Member Engagement Sessions.
- **Appendix 3:** Comments from the Chair of the Barbican Association.

7

Committees***The system isn't working***

232. Throughout my Review, the Corporation's Committee system has been a consistent target of strong and widespread criticism – so much so, in fact, that I was surprised that it has survived in its present form. It has become a means in itself rather than a means to an end.

233. In Part 4 I identified three particular problems of the Committee system: the number of Committees; the engagement of multiple committees with a single issue; and the sequencing of meetings of Committees involved, meaning that the convoy moves at the speed of the slowest ship. In this Part of my Report I identify some general issues relating to Committees, and then move on to propose a way in which the talent and expertise of Members could be put to better use, followed by proposals for a radical restructuring.

General issues***Are Members non-executives?***

234. In the course of my Review I was often told that Members, especially in their Committee work, should be regarded as non-execs. I do not agree. In a normal corporate environment, non-executive members sit with executive members, sharing corporate responsibility. But (except in a few cases governed by local rules) the non-execs as a group do not take decisions on their own. In Corporation Committees, on the other hand, the Members do have to take decisions. The key issue is the level at which they engage.

235. There is a temptation to micro-manage; a temptation, moreover, which is too often not resisted. Committees should set policy in their areas; agree (or secure) overall resources; review delivery and risk; and hold Officers to account – but for overall delivery, not for day-to-day activities. **This, combined with the review of delegations which I recommend later in this Report, should rebalance the Member/Officer relationship to the general benefit (and should also allow Committees to do their work with significantly fewer meetings).**

Committee staffs

236. Earlier I identified the quality of staff as a Corporation strength.⁶¹ The Corporation's Committees are served by highly competent Officers, but I think that **the work of Committees might be better enabled if Committee staff felt empowered to be more pro-active**, guiding Committees to a greater degree, perhaps commissioning papers (with Chair approval) when necessary. If my recommendations on restructuring the system are accepted, they will also have a role in diplomatically assisting Committees to keep to their terms of reference.

237. I am encouraged in this view by having been at one stage responsible for the staffing of House of Commons Select Committees. In that system Clerks, while of course not supplanting the primary role of Members, feel that they have an important complementary (and self-starting) role in contributing to a Committee's effectiveness and success.

Committee reports

238. I have been impressed by the quality of the reports submitted to Committees. They are authoritative, comprehensive and well – even stylishly – written. But they are often discursive, no doubt with the best of intentions, and this can encourage Committees to lose focus on matters for decision, or indeed to request further reports. **There should be a move to much shorter reports, focused on the single issue at hand, with the matters for decision clearly identified.** If my recommendation that the Corporation should go paperless is accepted, then there will be much less need to provide background; live links to the portal will access the necessary papers, and the concept of a free-standing “for information” paper, of which – as I noted earlier – there were more than 2,000 on agendas in 2018/19, should disappear.

Committee and Court minutes

239. **There is also scope for streamlining minutes throughout the organisation.** If my recommendation for webcasting all meetings⁶² is accepted, there will be a permanent record. Minutes can then adopt the style of the Cabinet Office, focusing on *decisions*, and recording discussion as economically as possible: “in discussion the following main points were made...”

⁶¹ See paragraph 84.

⁶² Paragraph 174.

Cancel when necessary

240. I have been struck by the number of very lightly loaded Committee and Sub-Committee meetings. **When there is little substantive business, Chairs should cancel meetings** (and Committee Clerks should feel free to suggest it).

241. A subset might be a planned reduction in the frequency of meetings, with the use of urgency/Chairman's decision when necessary.⁶³

Keep to Terms of Reference

242. This should be obvious. However, terms of reference of committees have developed over time; they show some signs of political compromise; they are sometimes loosely phrased; and there are some overlaps. If my recommendations on restructuring are accepted, **there will need to be a careful revisiting of Committee terms of reference to improve clarity and minimise overlap.**

Limit Sub-Committees

243. Setting up a Sub-Committee has almost become a default setting. But if there is real discipline in Committee business, and a raising of the Member/Officer threshold, then **setting up a Sub-Committee should be very much the exception**, and the system should be greatly simplified thereby.

244. In order to achieve this, I recommend that **there should be no general Committee power to establish Sub-Committees, and that SO 27.1.a should be repealed.** Any genuinely necessary Sub-Committee should be provided for in the terms of reference of the parent Committee (as the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee is to the Policy and Resources Committee). **And there would be merit in sunseting Sub-Committees so that explicit revival would be required if the Sub-Committee concerned were still needed.** I make further recommendations about terms of reference and Sub-Committees in paragraphs 281 and 282 below.

⁶³ Under SO 41.

Joint meetings

245. I am told that joint meetings of Committees have proved very useful on occasion, and such meetings may have merit in the restructured system.⁶⁴

Member briefing

246. If the leaner Committee structure which I propose is to realise its full potential, Members will need to have a really good understanding of their own Committee's business. I do not say that this does not happen already; but there are undoubted benefits to be had if all the Members of a Committee have a shared understanding of current developments in their area, and also an insight into the challenges with which Officers are dealing. **So regular briefings, in informal surroundings, not part of a Committee meeting, have a part to play.** This has occasionally happened with existing Committees, but should become a general practice.
247. My proposals will greatly reduce the number of Committee places available; but there will be merit in involving the wider membership of the Court nevertheless. One possibility might be **occasional briefings by individual Committees and their supporting Officers, whereby any Member of the Court can keep up with other Committees' current work and challenges.** This might also encourage the sense of collective effort which is lacking at the moment.

Chair training and appraisal

248. Some may see it as unnecessary or even demeaning, but a professional system requires the best possible approach to chairing, and **periodic training (even if only in the form of a mentoring discussion) should be routine.**
249. For the same reasons, **there should be a light-touch 360-degree appraisal of Chairs; and Chairs should be involved in the appraisal of senior Officers.**

Handling vacancies

250. At the moment vacancies on Committees are re-advertised, sometimes more than once. Vacant Committee places may be much rarer under my proposals, but in any event I recommend that **there should be no re-advertising of Committee vacancies.** A

⁶⁴ See SO 28, and my comments on the drafting of that SO in paragraph 158.

Committee should run with a vacant place which can be filled on a casual basis later if necessary. A Member can easily find out at any time which Committees have vacancies.

Green impact assessments

251. **I recommend that a “green impact assessment” should accompany every policy or project proposal submitted to Committee.** Other impact assessments are already used (and have been used for Brexit implications) but, given the headline commitment to environmental sustainability in the Corporation’s Corporate Plan, **green impact assessments seem to me to be essential.**

252. Even though environmental awareness should pervade the organisation, **there is much to be said for assigning climate issues, and the Corporation’s response, to a lead Committee.**⁶⁵

Committee not Ward

253. It is important that Members sitting on Committees should remember that as Committee Members their role is not to represent their Wards but to contribute in a dispassionate way to the Committee’s deliberations and decisions. I deal with Ward Committees in paragraphs 270 to 272 below.

Making best use of the talent

The challenge

254. There is a great deal of talent, skill and relevant experience among the Members of the Court of Common Council, but it is not effectively deployed on Committees.

255. This is partly because of the somewhat opaque method of appointment, and partly because of a culture that feels that new Members must serve an extended apprenticeship before getting Committee places that they may particularly want, or for which they are especially fitted or qualified.⁶⁶ This may also act as a deterrent to new Members who may have a lot to contribute to the Corporation.

⁶⁵ The Policy and Resources Committee has (Order of Appointment, paragraph 4(o)) sustainability issues as part of its portfolio, but this needs to be framed in rather more prescriptive terms.

⁶⁶ I acknowledge that the orders of appointment of certain committees provide that the membership should include a small number of Members with shorter periods of service on the Court; but these provisions as drafted have no link to skills and experience.

A Governance and Nominations Committee

256. I think the time has come for a wholly new approach. **I recommend the establishment of a Governance and Nominations Committee (G&NC), whose task would be to recommend Members for appointment to Committees on the basis of what they could contribute.**
257. As a first step in an appointment round, Members could put in for Committee places, setting out how they were qualified and what they could contribute.⁶⁷ The Committee would no doubt also take into account their attendance records at the Committees of which they had been members.
258. The Committee would make recommendations in respect of each Committee, to be decided upon by the Court. To provide a discretionary element, the Committee could recommend as appointable a number larger (by say 20%) than the number of places to be filled.
259. The same procedure could be followed with casual vacancies, or the Committee might be empowered to appoint in such cases without a Court decision.
260. As I observed in respect of the Competitiveness Committee, I am loath to recommend a new Committee while trying to simplify the structure but, as will be clear from later proposals, I have in mind that the Governance and Nominations Committee will absorb functions from elsewhere, so contributing to the overall reduction.
261. I do not make detailed recommendations about the membership of this Committee (although I think the Chief Commoner might be an appropriate *ex officio* member); but to give the Committee's nomination functions authority and credibility, **the membership should reflect the make-up of the Court of Common Council as a whole, rather than being limited to the "usual suspects"**. This does not mean, of course, that a modest number of "usual suspects" will not have a role to play in a total membership of about 15.

⁶⁷ This principle is recognised to a very limited extent in the current arrangements, as for example in the membership of the Capital Buildings Committee of two Court of Common Council Members "with appropriate experience, skills or knowledge", but the principle should operate across the whole system.

262. It may be thought that a Committee of this sort could become unduly influential; but, if applications were open, so also would be the degree to which the Committee discharged its functions objectively and impartially.

263. In paragraph 377 I list responsibilities which should go to the G&NC from Committees which I recommend should be re-organised or abolished.

Restructuring

Principles

264. I have proceeded on the basis that Committees need to align fairly closely to the activities needed to deliver the Corporate Plan. However, I do not think it wise to allow the elements of the Corporate Plan to dictate the Committee structure. Changes in the Plan should not then require changes in Committees.

265. I have rejected the possibility of each Committee having “its own” Chief Officer. Although individual Chief Officers will naturally work more closely with one Committee than with others, to formalise that relationship would be a recipe for creating silos at a time when the priority must be to break down silos and foster a corporate approach.

“Grand” and “Service” Committees

266. I do not see much point in the distinction between Grand Committees and Service Committees, and **I recommend that it is discontinued.** Committees should be simply Committees.

Size of Committees

267. Almost all Committees are much too big. The Committees/Boards listed below are in the order in which they appear in the *Appointment of Committees* document. The numbers of Members of some Committees cannot be definitive, as the orders of appointment contain provisions such “at least” and “not fewer than”.

- Policy and Resources 38
- Finance 39
- Capital Buildings 18

• Investment	27
• Audit and Risk Management	16
• Planning and Transportation	35
• Port Health and Environmental Services	33
• Markets	33
• Police Authority Board	13
• Crime and Disorder Scrutiny	8
• Culture, Heritage and Libraries	35
• Governing Bodies: City of London School	21
City of London Girls' School	21
City of London Freemen's School	22
• Guildhall School of Music and Drama	21
• Education Board	18
• Community and Children's Services	37
• Gresham (City Side)	12
• Establishment	17
• Open Spaces and City Gardens	12
• West Ham Park	15
• Epping Forest and Commons	16
• Hampstead Heath, Highgate Wood and Queen's Park	18
• Freedom Applications	10
• Barbican Residential	21
• Barbican Centre Board	20
• City Bridge Trust	17
• Standards	19
• Standards Appeals	12
• Licensing	15
• Health and Wellbeing Board	13
• Health and Social Care Scrutiny	7
• Local Government Pensions Board	7

268. Committees of 30 Members or more are not really Committees; they are in effect sub-plenaries: debating bodies, not fora for taking decisions. Even the smaller Committees in the list above are unwieldy; and the three Boards of Governors, together with the Boards of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama and of the Barbican Centre, are well above the recommended size for such bodies. I return to this latter point in Part 9 of this Report.

269. **I recommend that Committees should have no more than 15 Members, with an optimum size of between 12 and 15.** It may be that Planning and Transportation may need to be slightly larger in order to cope with the need to provide non-overlapping panels to consider applications.

Ward Committees

270. I can see no argument for the retention of Ward Committees. I have been told that they are desirable because they give new Members a chance to serve on Committees. I suggest that that clearly indicates that Ward Committees are there to provide a role, not to do a job, and I am not convinced.
271. **I therefore recommend the abolition of all the Ward Committees as Ward Committees: Finance; Planning and Transportation; Port Health and Environmental Services; Markets; Culture, Heritage and Libraries; and Community and Children's Services;** Where their role survives into the new structure, they should be reconstituted as subject Committees of between 12 and 15 Members.
272. This means that **SO 23 should be repealed and SO 24 amended.**

Multiple membership

273. SO 22 sets a maximum number of Committees on which Member may serve at eight. Moreover, the limit does not apply to additional, *ex officio*, membership of Committees; and it also allows membership of a Committee on which a Member is filling a twice-advertised vacancy to be added above the limit. I find this extraordinary. It also suggests that a Committee's work is not sufficiently valued. Full participation in a Committee's work, taking into account time needed for preparation and for events outside a Committee's formal sittings, should be demanding and will be time-consuming.
274. Setting *ex officio* memberships outside the limit is illogical. Such memberships will usually be because the Member concerned chairs another, relevant, Committee. That should mean more work, not less, if the liaison role is to be carried out effectively.

275. I recommend that

- **no Member should be a member of more than two Committees;**
- **that membership of *one* of the governing bodies of the independent schools and of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama; of the Barbican Centre Board; and of the Police Authority Board should not count against this limit (I later recommend that these Boards should be taken out of the committee structure);**
- ***ex officio* membership of a Committee or Committees should raise the limit to four. It may occasionally be that a single Chair carries with it more than four *ex officio* memberships. In such cases the limit should not apply; and**
- **SO 22 is amended accordingly.**

Service on outside bodies

276. SO 43 provides that a Member may not serve as a representative of the City Corporation on more than six outside bodies at a time. This does not include *ex officio* appointments. This limit seems high, but on the basis that such membership may not be unduly demanding **I do not recommend a change.**

Chair terms

277. SO 29 specifies the terms⁶⁸ for which a Chair may be held: Policy and Resources, five years; Finance, five years; the Police Authority Board, four years; and other Committees, three years. These seem reasonable, but for consistency **there is a case for making all Chair terms four years.**

Deputy Chairs

278. Under SO 30.3.a, an immediate past Chair becomes Deputy Chair for the first year of the new Chair. I do not think that this is a good idea, and is certainly not in accordance with current best practice. The new occupant of the Chair needs to start a term afresh

⁶⁸ Expressed in years consecutively.

without the possibly brooding presence of his or her predecessor. Any guidance from experience that may be needed can be drawn upon informally. **I therefore recommend that a Chair ending a term of office should not be eligible to rejoin that Committee during the successor's term of office. The SO will need amendment accordingly.**

Chairs-in-waiting

279. There is a current practice whereby the Member who is to take the Chair is identified and becomes a Chair-in-waiting for two years. This seems an unnecessarily long time. A year should be long enough.

Member terms

280. There will be a degree of “institutional churn” as a result of elections, personal preferences and other factors. However, there are examples of Members remaining on Committees for a very long time. **I therefore recommend that the maximum period of service on a Committee should be eight years, with four years to pass before rejoining. *Ex officio* memberships should be excluded from this rule. SO 24 will need to be amended accordingly.**

Committee terms of reference

281. Under SO 21 Committees are “reconstituted” each year at the first regular meeting of the Court in April. The terms of reference of each Committee are included in the *Appointment of Committees* document. The opportunity is frequently taken by individual Committees to seek amendment of their terms of reference, and such requests are routinely approved. **This seems to me to be a recipe for mission creep and overlap.**

282. **I therefore recommend that:**

- **following the restructuring of the Committee system, the terms of reference of each Committee should be in its own Standing Order;⁶⁹ and that**
- **amendment of any set of terms of reference (including a request to establish a Sub-Committee) should be considered by the Court only following a recommendation by the Governance and Nominations Committee.**

⁶⁹ And so not combined with the Order of Appointment.

Aldermanic seats

283. Even though they have their own Court of Aldermen, Aldermen sit as Members of the Court of Common Council, and, depending upon the terms of reference of individual Committees, have seats reserved for them.
284. In order to draw fully upon the resource represented by the Aldermen, **I recommend that there should be no bar, formal or by convention, to an Alderman being Chair of any Committee.**
285. If Aldermen were to be represented *pro rata* in the new Committee structure, they would account for one seat in every five. However, I do not recommend reserved places, which may well vary from Committee to Committee; this will be something for the new Governance and Nominations Committee to consider in making their recommendations.

“Rapporteurs”

286. In the leaner Committee structure, taking into account the considerable workload that will continue to fall upon Chairs of Committees, there may be a role for *rapporteurs*, in the Continental usage: Members taking the lead on particular subjects within a Committee’s area. This happens to some extent already, but in the context of smaller Committees it may be worth using more extensively.

The new Committee structure

287. I deal with the current Committees in the order in which they appear in the *Appointment of Committees* document. New Committees appear in the place of a Committee I propose that they should absorb. An annotated list of Committees, reflecting my recommendations, is at Appendix F.

The Policy and Resources Committee

288. I am aware of a feeling amongst Members that the P&RC has become in effect a Cabinet, even though the formal power to apply “executive arrangements” under Chapter 2 of the Local Government Act 2000 does not apply to the Corporation.

289. Nevertheless, the Corporation needs a co-ordinating Committee to take the lead in pursuing its corporate aims; and that Committee needs to draw together, through the membership of certain Chairs of other Committees, the Corporation's work as a whole. P&RC will need to be much smaller in order to operate effectively and provide a dynamic at the centre of the organisation.
290. I suggest that **the remodelled P&RC should have as *ex officio* members the Chairs of Governance and Nominations (new Committee), Finance, Property (new Committee), Planning and Transportation, Port Health and Environmental Services, the Police Authority Board, Community and Children's Services, and Culture, Heritage and Libraries (to be renamed "Culture");** a total of eight seats out of an ideal of 15.
291. **The Deputy Chairs of Finance and of Investment (which latter Committee in any event I recommend abolishing) should not have seats;** but the Deputy Chair of Finance could deputise for the Chair if necessary.
292. The Lord Mayor should remain as an *ex officio* member, reflecting the importance of drawing Guildhall and Mansion House more closely together, even though the demands of office mean that the incumbent may often not be able to attend.
293. The Chief Commoner has an important role to play in the Corporation more generally, but I do not see that post as a strong contender for *ex officio* membership of the Committee, although the Chief Commoner would be an appropriate *ex officio* member of the Governance and Nominations Committee.
294. **There should not be seats for any Members who have seats in Parliament. This is an historical survival, which should end.**
295. **Residential representation on the Committee should end; it is not an appropriate element for the issues with which P&RC has to deal.** It also institutionalises the confusion between Committee responsibilities and Ward representation.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ See paragraph 253.

296. The system of having three Deputy Chairs of this Committee does not seem to have worked well; it has led to a degree of confusion of roles, and should be discontinued. **One designated Deputy Chair is enough.**

Sub-Committees of P&RC

297. **The Resource Allocation Sub-Committee should continue.**
Of the other Sub-Committees:

- **Courts:** this was set up in 2016 and is due to be sunsetted in 2021. **It should be abolished now**, in view of the fact that the General Purposes Committee of the Court of Aldermen is equipped to deal with Courts issues;
- **Hospitality (working party):** as I suggested in paragraph 191, hospitality issues will need to be co-ordinated with the broader competitiveness agenda, and **so should fall to the Competitiveness Committee**, not needing a separate Sub-Committee;
- **Members' Privileges:** this rarely meets, and will naturally **fall to the Governance and Nominations Committee (GNC)**, which should not need a separate Sub-Committee to deal with any business under this head;
- **Outside Bodies:** does not appear to have met since January 2018. It is in any event very lightly loaded and **any residual functions should be transferred to the Governance and Nominations Committee (GNC)**, which should not need to set up a Sub-Committee to discharge them;
- **Projects:** to be taken on by the new **Property Committee**; and
- **Public Relations and Economic Development:** with the establishment of the Competitiveness Committee, **this is unnecessary and should be abolished**;

Finance Committee

298. I see no need for a separate Investment Committee, especially as this is a Committee which seems to have had a tendency to follow

its own, rather than a corporate line. **Accordingly I recommend folding the Investment Committee into the Finance Committee**, which is perfectly capable of discharging this function (some functions may fall to the Property Committee I recommend below). Of the existing Sub-Committees of the Finance Committee:

- **Corporate Assets:** the business of this Sub-Committee includes some relatively low-level items which might be dealt with under revised delegations to Officers. In any event, its business seems appropriate to be dealt with by the new Property Committee which I recommend. **It need not be retained.**
- **Digital Services:** digital services as a responsibility of a finance committee is a frequent survival in many organisations, but has been overtaken in the modern context. If digital services are not to be the task of a separate Committee (and there are arguments in favour of that solution) **then it should be the responsibility of the G&NC, and will need to be a Sub-Committee of that Committee.**
- **Efficiency and Performance:** I think that this Sub-Committee should struggle to survive, given its very light loading. **It should be absorbed into the Audit and Risk Management Committee;**
- **Finance and Grants Oversight:** I do not think that the level of business warrants the existence of this Sub-Committee, nor its being under the wing of the Finance Committee. **The new Bridge House Estates Committee can fulfil this function;**
- **Procurement:** this Sub-Committee **has a continuing role to play, even though its scrutiny thresholds are much too low.**

299. **The Social Investment Board, at present reporting to the Investment Committee, should be abolished** as its functions will be absorbed by the new Bridge House Estates Committee (see paragraph 369 below).

Property Committee (new Committee)

300. At the moment there is insufficient co-ordination and oversight, and there is a dilution of decision-making and

accountability across several committees. **I recommend the establishment of a new Property Committee to bring together all the City's property functions**, including the Property Investment Board; the Markets Committee (so far as this needs to be a Committee responsibility in its current form); the Capital Buildings Committee; the Projects Sub-Committee of P&RC; and any residual functions of the Barbican Residential Committee (which I recommend should be abolished).

301. Through subordinate but empowered Project Boards, this Committee should be in a position to ensure tight programme co-ordination and oversight, with the members of those bodies developing a real understanding and knowledge of the projects they are overseeing.

302. There might be an argument for putting the Open Spaces Committee into this new Committee, but I think it is better kept separate, not least as a way of folding in the various Open Spaces and Parks Committees.

Capital Buildings Committee

303. See the new Property Committee.

Investment Committee

304. See the Finance Committee.

Audit and Risk Management Committee

305. There are good governance reasons for having a separate Audit Committee, with which Risk Management normally sits comfortably. **The Committee should take on the responsibilities of the Efficiency and Performance Sub-Committee of the Finance Committee (but without setting up a Sub-Committee to do so).**

Planning and Transportation Committee

306. **This should continue with its present responsibilities (but with a sharply reduced membership).** The statutory functions of the Committee are set out in Appendix G.

307. **The planning process will be effective and resilient if the Committee majors on setting a strategic and policy framework.**

Applications are then more easily dealt with by Officers⁷¹, leaving the Committee to deal with substantial or strategic cases, potential breaches of policy, or contentious issues.

308. It is important to emphasise that the purpose of examining planning proposals is to provide dispassionate assessment and compliance with agreed policies, not to debate on behalf of electors.

309. **Where Member consideration of proposals is required, this should be through small panels. No Member should sit on a panel considering an application in his or her Ward, or which might affect his or her Ward.** It has been suggested to me that there should be standing geographical panels, but I do not agree; there is a risk that such an arrangement can become cosy. The panels should be assembled afresh as required.

310. I am aware of concern that it is harder to maintain absolute propriety in the case of a small planning committee by comparison with a large one. This may possibly be the case; but *ad hoc* panels, with visibility by the Committee, should minimise this risk.

311. I have been asked to consider the possibility of conflict when the Corporation is both the developer and the planning authority, and this may be a convenient place to deal with the issue. I have helpfully been provided with papers for four contentious applications which help expose the issues.

312. Regulation 10 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992⁷² governs arrangements for taking decisions on planning applications. It prohibits the decision being taken by a committee, sub-committee or officer if any of them has any responsibility for the management of any land or building to which the application relates. The Corporation is subject to this requirement.

313. The issue is also covered by the Corporation's Planning Protocol, which forms part of the Code of Governance, and which says: "A Member of the Planning and Transportation Committee who is, at the same time, a member of a City of London Corporation committee responsible for a site or building that is the subject of an

⁷¹ As 97% of cases are at the moment.

⁷² S.I., 1992, No. 1492.

application does not, by that fact, have an interest that is disclosable under the Code of Conduct.”⁷³

314. This is in my view too lax. **It does not meet the accepted conduct standard of something which may be perceived to give rise to bias, and should be amended or removed.**
315. The Planning Protocol also says that if a Member of the Planning and Transportation Committee is a member of another Committee which is the applicant or which has taken a view on the application, he or she should not participate in the decision on the application.⁷⁴ **This should be amplified to include participation in consideration or debate, not merely decision.**
316. The restructuring of Committees is an opportunity to distance the planning function from the proprietorial; **I recommend that no member of the new Property Committee should be eligible for appointment to the Planning and Transportation Committee.** This will not of course entirely remove the possibility of conflict, which may arise in respect of other functions, including Open Spaces, the Schools, the Guildhall School of Music and Drama, the Barbican Centre and the Police Authority Board; but it reduces the possibility of institutionalised conflict.
317. The Committee has two Sub-Committees at the moment: Local Plans and Streets and Walkways. Local Plans is lightly loaded but I do not see a pressing case for its absorption into the main Committee. Streets and Walkways has a useful portfolio of its own.

Port Health and Environmental Services Committee

318. Apart from reducing its size to the new 12-15 Member norm, I have no other recommendation to make. The Committee’s statutory obligations are set out in Appendix G.

Markets Committee

319. I acknowledge the strong sense of connection that many members of this Committee feel with the markets and their development; but it is a lightly loaded Committee which meets every two months. Much of the routine business can be left to Officers and

⁷³ Paragraph 7(5).

⁷⁴ Paragraph 10.

the consolidation project will fall to the new Property Committee. **I recommend that it should be abolished.**

Police Authority Board

320. I deal with the Police Authority Board in Part 9.

Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee

321. The Police and Justice Act 2006 requires relevant authorities (which includes the Corporation) to have a “crime and disorder committee” to “review or scrutinise decisions made, or other action taken...in discharge...of crime and disorder functions” and “to make reports or recommendations to the local authority with respect to the discharge of those functions”.⁷⁵

322. The Act allows the Common Council itself to act as the Crime and Disorder Scrutiny Committee, but this would not be a practical arrangement, and it has never done so. However, the Committee appointed by the Corporation to comply with its duties under the Act has met only once, on 7th July 2016, some ten years after the statutory duty was imposed; and it has not met since.

323. **As it is a statutory requirement to have such a Committee I can hardly recommend its abolition, but this situation perhaps calls for some re-examination.**

Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee

324. **I suggest that the somewhat tautologous title is simplified to “Culture Committee”.**

325. The Committee has only one Sub-Committee: the rather niche Benefices Sub-Committee. **I see no reason to change its status.**

326. I have been urged to put the Barbican Centre Board under the wing of the Culture Committee, but I make a different recommendation in Part 9.

327. **The Keats House Consultative Committee should be treated in the same way as the bodies covered by the Open Spaces Committee (see paragraphs 341 to 348) and the separate existence of the Consultative Committee ended.**

⁷⁵ Section 19.

362. I was glad to find that a Corporate Charities Review is in progress.⁸¹ It seems to be focused in exactly the right way, and I therefore make no further comment on the broader issue, but now turn to the specifics of the City Bridge Trust Committee and Bridge House Estates.

The Committee and Bridge House Estates

363. The Committee is charged with administering the Bridge House Estates charity.⁸² The charity's primary purpose is to maintain five bridges across the Thames; surplus income may be used for more general purposes within Greater London – the “ancillary object”.

364. This charity is a so-called *cy-près* scheme; that is, one which allows the wishes of a donor or donors to a charity to be carried out even if the original purpose of the gift has failed. The Charity Commission has the power to apply the *cy-près* doctrine as appropriate.

365. The Bridge House Estates (BHE) charity is a very large one – in terms of asset valuation, the seventh largest in the UK, and its governing documents are complex, originating over a period of more than seven centuries.

366. Unfortunately its governance exhibits all the weaknesses of charity governance referred to in paragraphs 359 and 360 above, and represents serious legal and reputational risks. No fewer than 19 Corporation Committees and other bodies impinge upon the charity in some way.

367. I have been presented with a proposal that would address these weaknesses. It would create a Bridge House Estates Committee (BHEC) replacing the City Bridge Trust Committee, and exercising management and control of BHE. The Corporation would remain the charity Trustee with overall responsibility, and certain high-level decisions would be taken by the Court of Common Council.

⁸¹ The charities within scope of Phase One of the review, generally where the Trustee is the Corporation acting through the Court of Common Council, are listed in Appendix H.

⁸² Charity No. 1035628, in accordance with a Scheme made by the Charity Commissioners on 9th February 1995 (as amended) and brought into effect by the Charities (The Bridge House Estates) Order 1995.

368. Crucially, this arrangement would remove the complex involvement of multiple Committees entirely, and leave the management of the charity in the hands of the BHEC.
369. The proposal envisages the BHEC being supported by five Sub-Committees: Bridge Management; Grants; ⁸³ Finance; Investment; and Audit and Risk. This is more than ideally I would like to see, and it might be that the finance function could be discharged by the main Committee. The responsibilities of the Social Investment Board, which I earlier recommended should be abolished,⁸⁴ would be vested in one of the Sub-Committees, probably Grants.
370. A key element of the new arrangements will be the opportunity to have a properly constituted and empowered (and accountable) charity board. Best practice suggests that such a board should have no more than 12 members. Those who are Members of the Court of Common Council should be nominated by the Governance and Nominations Committee, taking into account the mix of skills required by the Board. Given the risk of re-introducing the conflict problem, it would be best to have no *ex officio* places.
371. The remaining members of the Committee would be external co-opted members, recruited by due process, again to contribute to the appropriate mix of skills.
372. **I recommend that this proposal should be urgently pursued, to lead to the creation of a Bridge House Estates Committee; and that the City Bridge Trust Committee should be abolished.**

The Standards Committee and the Standards Appeals Committee

373. In the next Part of the Report I consider the standards regime, and conclude that the Standards Committee (and with it the Standards Appeals Committee) should be abolished and replaced with a new system.

Licensing Committee

374. This is a statutory Committee, responsible for the Corporation's licensing functions under a number of legislative

⁸³ Termed the Trust Sub-Committee in the proposal.

⁸⁴ See paragraph 299.

which Committees should of course be fully involved) and more detailed matters which are more appropriately left to Officers.

383. One good example is SO 52 relating to write-offs, where decisions are for Committees to take, and where the limits are set extraordinarily low, any write-off of more than £10,000 having to be approved by the Finance Committee. A limit of £3,500 per term for the writing-off of school fees seems very low; but if my recommendations are implemented, such decisions will be for Boards of Governors to take.
384. There will in any need to be a different approach to the institutions whose freeing from the Committee structure I recommend. There the approach will have to be to set financial envelopes and broad principles for the purchase of services, but with the processes determined locally.
385. **Any review of delegations should be repeated at regular intervals, both as to financial limits, but also to ensure that delegations remain appropriate in the light of the changing operations of the Corporation and its Committees.**

APPENDIX G

CITY OF LONDON COMMITTEES: STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

[As at February 2020]

Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama

- Operates under a separate Instrument and Articles of Government in accordance with section 29 of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992.

Police Authority Board

Statutory functions:

- Responsible for any powers and duties vested in the Court of Common Council as police authority for the City of London by virtue of the City of London Police Act 1839, and other relevant legislation (save the appointment of the Commissioner of Police, which by virtue of Section 3 of the City of London Police Act 1839 remains the responsibility of the Common Council).

Planning and Transportation Committee

Statutory functions:

- Responsible for all functions of the City as local planning authority.
- All functions of the Common Council as local highway, traffic, walkway and parking authority (other than in respect of powers expressly delegated to another committee) and the improvement of other open land under S.4 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1952.
- All functions under part II of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1967 including declaration, alteration and discontinuance of City Walkway.
- All functions relating to the construction, maintenance and repair of sewers in the City, including public sewers (on behalf of Thames Water under an agency arrangement).
- All functions of Common Council as Lead Local Flood Authority in relation to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010.

- All functions relating to street naming and numbering under the London Building Acts (Amendment) Act 1939.
- All functions relating to building control under the Building Act 1984, Building Regulations 2000-10 and London Building Acts 1930-82.
- The setting of building control charges under the Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 2010.
- Response to and resolution of dangerous structures under the London Building Acts (Amendment) Act 1939.
- All functions relating to the Local Land Charges Act 1975.

Port Health and Environmental Services Committee

Statutory functions:

- Responsible for all the City of London Corporation's environmental health, port health, animal health, consumer protection, licensing (with the exception of those which are in the province of another Committee), public conveniences, street cleansing, refuse collection and disposal, the street trading enforcement functions in the London Local Authorities Act 1990 including any decision as to whether the s.101 arrangements should be discontinued, and cemetery and crematorium functions.
- The implementation of those sections of any Acts of Parliament and/or European legislation which direct that the local authority take action in respect of those duties listed at above.

Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee

Statutory functions:

- the management of the City's libraries and archives, including its functions as a library authority in accordance with the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 and all other powers and provisions relating thereto by providing an effective and efficient library service.

Community and Children's Services Committee

Membership:

- Two to five elected parent governor representatives required by law (can only vote in relation to education functions).

Governance Review: Member Engagement Sessions
Planning: Session 1
8 January 2021

Present

Sheriff Christopher Hayward (in the Chair)	Vivienne Littlechild
Munsur Ali	Natasha Lloyd-Owen
Rehana Ameer	Oliver Lodge
Randall Anderson	Deputy Edward Lord
Matthew Bell	Alderman & Sheriff Professor Michael Mainelli
Deputy John Bennett	Paul Martinelli
Peter Bennett	Alderman Bronek Masojada
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Jeremy Mayhew
Henry Colthurst	Deputy Brian Mooney
Karina Dostalova	Hugh Morris
Deputy David Bradshaw	Deputy Alastair Moss
Peter Dunphy	Graham Packham
Mary Durcan	Alderman Sir Andrew Parmley
Alderman Emma Edhem	Susan Pearson
John Edwards	Judith Pleasance
Deputy Kevin Everett	Deputy Henry Pollard
Anne Fairweather	Jason Pritchard
Helen Fentimen	Elizabeth Rogula
Sophie Fernandes	Ruby Sayed
Marianne Fredericks	John Scott
Alderman Alison Gowman	Jeremy Simons
Tracey Graham	Deputy Tom Sleigh
Graeme Harrower	Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy Tom Hoffman	Deputy James Thomson
Michael Hudson	James Tumbridge
Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney	Mark Wheatley
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Shravan Joshi	Dawn Wright

Introduction

Sheriff Hayward, in the Chair, opened the meeting and thanked Members for joining today's session. He then introduced the session, setting out the process for Member consultation on relevant aspects of the review, with documents to inform the consultation session having been circulated in advance. Sheriff Hayward then summarised the references and recommendations with Lord Lisvane's review regarding the Planning & Transportation Committee.

Prior to debating the recommendations set out by Lord Lisvane, a Member spoke to raise general observations on the recommendations and the Planning & Transportation Committee:

- The Member was attending in order to listen to Members' views, but advised of their broad agreement with the proposals within the Lisvane review, recognising that there were several issues relating to the Committee's governance and format which needed to be addressed.
- The Member added that they endorsed Lisvane's recognition of the important roles of the Local Plans and Streets & Walkways Sub Committees and recommendation that they remain as they are.

Recommendations: Members' Comments and Observations

Members then proceeded to debate the various recommendations.

Paragraphs 267 - 272: Size of Committees and Ward Committee Status

- Several Members registered their agreement with reducing the size of the Committee in general terms.
- Some Members commented that the size of Committees and whether Ward Committees were retained needed to be discussed at a general level before considering an appropriate size and arrangement for the Planning & Transportation Committee.
- A Member added further to this that they felt the size of the Court of Common Council should be reduced, as there were too many Common Councillors.
- It was observed that, in terms of numbers, the Committee was significantly bigger than the Planning Committees at other London Local Authorities; however, another Member responded that, when comparing the size of the Planning Committee to other authorities' Planning Committees as a proportion of the Council membership, the size of the City's Committee was in keeping with others.
- A number of Members spoke against reducing the size of the Committee or removing its Ward Committee status, arguing in support of retaining a larger Committee. They cited the benefits of a larger committee, such as better oversight, diversity of comment and perspective, protection against bias, more legitimate decisions, and more challenges during the decision-making process. It was also suggested that a larger committee provided a significant bulwark against corruption or the perception thereof, as it was more difficult to influence.
- A Member argued that the size of the Committee was not the root of the perceived inefficiencies in its operation and that the nature of reporting to the Committee and the division of labour between the Grand Committee and its Sub Committees should be given fundamental reconsideration.
- Several Members were open to the idea of reducing the size of the Committee in some way whilst retaining it as a Ward Committee; for instance, perhaps

through the Court of Aldermen relinquishing its appointment rights to the Committee, or by merging Ward representation.

- However, others also spoke against the removal of Aldermen from the Committee, arguing that Aldermen played an important role on the Committee and an integral role within their Wards; it was also a crucial learning opportunity for prospective Mayoral candidates.
- A Member argued that the Committee could be reduced to as little as 12 Members and still operate with a satisfactory level of Ward representation, with some imagination or creativity applied to shared representation.
- A Member stressed that Planning Committees elsewhere were also structured on a party-political basis, as well as by Wards. This affected proportions, allocations and the overall size.
- Several individuals advanced the view that, as the Planning & Transportation Committee affected all Wards, and had the greatest effect on residents, it must be retained as a Ward Committee; however, others commented that there was a fundamental problem with Ward arrangements, in that they gave Members the perception that they should only or primarily be representing their own Ward, when they should, in fact, be considering applications in accordance with planning principles.
- A Member who had past experience chairing Ward Committees reflected on the challenges in corralling Members to constructive debate. It was also observed that the current arrangements could be burdensome on smaller Wards, albeit this was to some degree a consequence of having small Wards in the first place.
- Several Members made comparisons to the Licensing Committee and arrangements for Licensing (Hearing) Sub Committees, arguing that these arrangements could be used in the Planning context. In particular, they noted that Members could not sit on Licensing (Hearing) Sub Committee panels where the licensing application related to a premises within that Member's Ward, which seemed a good basis by which to operate.
- It was also suggested that Members had ample opportunity to use their voice or represent their Ward by speaking on a planning application in their capacity as a Ward Member and not necessarily sitting on the relevant committee.
- Several Members spoke in support of the idea that Members should not be able to vote on applications relating to their own Ward. Some suggested that they could be allowed to speak on such items, but not vote.
- One Member cited the arrangements for Barbican Residential Committee in comparison, wherein Members of the Committee that were residents of the Barbican Estate could not vote on certain issues. This principle was well-adhered to, and resident Members were still allowed to speak on these issues.

- A Member commented that a former Policy & Resources Committee Chairman had previously proposed that the Committee cease to be a Ward Committee, and that a Panel system be introduced, but these proposals had been decided against.
- However, a number of Members spoke in favour of Ward Committee arrangements, whether that be in general or specific to the Planning & Transportation Committee, or with some reform to the existing arrangements.
- A Member advised that they agreed with the recommendations of the Lisvane review, apart from his points on Ward Committees, and advised that they had misgivings about the abolition of Ward Committees generally.
- A Member argued that issues that arose with constituents in most if not all Wards were usually related to Planning & Transportation Committee matters, and constituents wanted to know what was going on, and what Members intended to do about it. Consequently, if Members were not able to have a direct influence, it would be problematic.
- Another Member responded that it was right to say Planning matters were a top concern for voters but that they disagreed with the conclusions drawn, as Ward Members were specifically and deliberately not involved with applications in their own Ward at other local authorities, and thus did not have a direct influence as a matter of course.
- A Member suggested that the Wards be bundled together in categories, such as Residential or Business, to allow for allocation or appointment and a smaller committee (or to select panels).
- A Member commented that they were open to greater use of the Sub Committees and Panels, but if this were the case then the Grand Committee should remain as a Ward Committee.
- Another Member advised that they would support keeping a large Grand Committee, with Ward Committee arrangements, but suggested small reforms such as pairing some Wards together, and having fewer two-seat Wards, in order to reduce the size of the Committee.
- A Member commented that Lord Lisvane's proposal for a Governance & Nominations Committee and stricter Committee limits would rectify a number of issues on the Planning & Transportation and other Committees, but added their doubt that these measures would be implemented.

Paragraphs 306 - 317: Planning & Transportation Committee

General Observations

- It was recognised that perceived problems with the existing arrangements were split between views that the issue was the format and running of Committee meetings, and those who felt it was a question of constitution and structural arrangements.
- A number of Members raised concerns about the current format of meetings and gave their views as to the reasons for this and suggestions to improve in this area.
- There were also concerns regarding the cumulative effect of small changes, with Members stressing that any reforms had to be targeted, congruous and well-evidenced. A Member commented that they felt there was an issue with silo working which would be exacerbated if matters were not considered in the round.
- Members observed that recent meetings were running well over time, as Members felt obliged to contribute, and that there was often a ‘concertina’ effect on the consideration of items as time went on during a meeting, with items receiving progressively less attention.
- It was suggested that there was a distinct division within meetings wherein there was a group of Members determined to refuse all applications, and a group of Members determined to approve all applications.
- A Member remarked that the Committee was currently the subject of much concern, particularly amongst residents. Whilst this might be unfair or unjustified it was, nevertheless, the case; therefore, reforms should be seen through that prism.
- A Member commented that the current workload for Committee Members was an issue for working Members, and that site visits or non-Committee meetings were difficult to attend. The Member added that they thought it was incorrect to suggest Members were obliged to take on a certain level of workload when joining the Committee and reflected on their democratic right to represent their constituents to the best of their ability.
- However, Members also spoke in defence of the Committee’s existing arrangements. Members noted that Lord Lisvane had less to say about the Planning & Transportation Committee than a number of other Committees. A Member also commented that they did not feel the Lisvane proposals revealed significant issues with the Committee or provided strong reasons for abandoning the existing arrangements.
- Whilst it was broadly recognised that there were some issues with the running of the Committee, several Members argued that these often arose from the depth of understanding, scrutiny and engagement of committed Members.
- A Member added that they feared losing oversight and governance on detailed applications, which should be detailed, with good discussion and scrutiny.

- Further comments were made suggest keeping detail and for information reports, and that more of the heavy lifting could be pushed onto the Sub Committees.
- It was commented that Members needed to avoid pitting people against each other and find common ground, as the shared goal was a thriving City of London.
- In addition to this, it was suggested that the balance of demand was likely to change going forward and Members were urged not to be restrictive in their reforms. A Member added that the Local Plan was a tool of the City's own making and should be adaptable and changed as circumstances required.
- Another Member stressed the importance of considering residents more, arguing that Ward Members should be involved more and at an earlier stage of the planning application process.
- Another Member suggested that applications particularly relevant to residents could be considered at specially convened afternoon meetings.
- Several Members cited a recent report by Transparency International, suggesting that the report could be used in guiding reforms, or that the Committee move to become fully compliant with its recommendations.
- A Member proposed that the City of London Corporation should extend its publishing of records of meetings to include officer-level meetings and non-Committee meetings.
- It was observed that criticism of Local Authority Planning Committees was fairly widespread, and that a number of common criticisms applied to the City of London Corporation, so should be addressed.
- A Member commented that the Committee should consider separating out consideration of applications from other business.
- A Member advised that they felt the overall manner of recommendations could lead to further centralisation of power amongst a core of certain Members, which needed to be prevented.
- As a general comment, a Member proposed that an outgoing Chairman should drop off the Committee for a period following their term.
- It was also commented that the Planning & Transportation Committee might also benefit from more connection with the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee.

Panel System and changes to Ward arrangements at Committee

- Several Members spoke in support of Lord Lisvane's recommendation on the introduction of small Panels. A Member commented that this was common practice at other local authorities for the consideration of applications.

- Members observed that the Licensing Committee provided a good model for Panel working and could be used to solve the issues of Ward Members and affected Wards. Members could also get involved at an earlier stage.
- A Member commented that Panels could be utilised to undertake more detailed work, freeing up the Grand Committee for more strategic and policy work. The Member added that the introduction of a Panel system could be revisited after other governance changes had been implemented.
- There were also reservations expressed about Panels, with Members cognisant of the limitations or potential issues of a Panel system. Several Members highlighted the process of Panel selection as potentially problematic, and that this would need to be carefully thought through, and clear on appointments and constraints that would be represented on panels.
- Another Member commented that the arguments for the introduction of a Panel system were largely based on efficiency, but the extent of their efficiency was dependent on implementation, adding that there were many ways to implement a Panel system.
- A Member felt that a flawed implementation of a Panel system for City of London planning applications would carry a significant risk of reputational damage. The Member added that it was likely to lead to more appeals in any case.
- A Member cautioned that it would be easier to sway decisions on small Panels, and decisions would be more predictable based on which Members were on a given Panel.
- It was observed that a Panel system bestowed significant power on the person selecting the Panel and their selection would effectively make the decision in some cases. This would be more open to corruption.
- A Member commented that there might also be issues with randomly selected or pre-selected Panels, as they may not be appropriate for the items which they are due to consider. The Member added that there would therefore need to be mechanisms to change Panels as required.
- A Member argued that a majority of the current Committee represented Business Wards and, consequently, they felt that some Members saw their role as supporting office developments. The Member added that they felt this kind of unfair decision would continue under a Panel system, but without the same level of scrutiny.
- As a general comment on a Panel system, a Member commented that they felt Panels of four Members would be too small, and Panels of sixteen would be too big.
- It was observed that Licensing Members must be fully trained before they can sit on Licensing (Hearing) Sub Committee Panels. This was beneficial in the

Licensing context and should be applied to Planning & Transportation Committee Panels.

Conflicts of Interest / Committee Cross-over

- Members discussed several connected issues relating to the constitution of the Committee: Members that had professional connections to the property or planning industries, Members who were also Members of the Property Investment Board, or other/future property-based Committees, and requirements relating to knowledge or expertise.
- It was noted the City of London Corporation was subject to Regulation 10 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, paragraph 312-313, which prohibited decisions being taken by a committee, sub-committee or officer if any of them has any responsibility for the management of any land or building to which the application relates.
- It was also noted that Lord Lisvane had made a strong recommendation regarding the establishment of a Governance and Nominations Committee, which would be charged with mitigating against these issues.
- Several Members spoke in favour of prohibiting Members from serving on both the Planning & Transportation Committee and the Property Investment Board, or a prospective Property Committee.
- A Member commented that they were open to such a rule, but stressed that it needed to be carefully considered, questioning the amount of conflict there actually was between the respective bodies.
- Further to this, another Member advised that it was very rarely that the Property Investment Board considered matters directly relevant to City Planning applications; therefore, a blanket ban would be clumsy.
- Some Members were of the view that there was value in having Members on both committees given expertise and cross-over of knowledge.
- Further to this point, a Member argued that the biggest issue for electors was the involvement of Members with any development interests serving on the Planning & Transportation Committee, adding that this was a more significant issue of conflict than the Property Investment Board. The Member posited that if one's livelihood depended on developments taking place then it naturally invited questions as to their independence, whether this was justified or not.
- A Member added that there was a perception of partiality within the planning industry and they felt it was unlikely that property professionals would not have vested interests. However, the Member felt that Lord Lisvane's recommendations would increase the involvement of property professionals in the Committee's work.

- Some Members expressed reluctance to exclude property professionals but were clear that any perception of conflict or other issues should require individuals to recuse themselves, adding that existing arrangements could be strengthened in order to improve perception in this regard.
- A number of Members spoke in support of those Members with professional connections or a background or expertise serving on the Committee, on the basis that this was a valuable strength and should not be considered an issue. It was observed that many Members of the Court had backgrounds, knowledge and experience in property, and this should be used rather than actively excluded.
- Members commented that there was no history of improper behaviour and that there was a Standards regime in place to act should there ever be. Members with property expertise had always been observed as acting appropriately, and as long as appropriate safeguards against bribery or corruption were in place, disqualifications on the basis of expertise should not be necessary.
- A Member reported that the Planning system was inherently vulnerable to corruption, but they had never observed any hint of corruption during their time on the Court.
- Other Members registered their reluctance to introduce bars to Committee membership in a blanket way, as relevant issues could be dealt with via other mechanisms, like not allowing particular Members to vote on particular items. A Member added that disqualifications on the basis of interests were already covered well under the existing arrangements.
- A Member reported their concern about Lord Lisvane's suggestions in respect of qualifications or credentials, as the perspective of a layman Member was equally valuable in discharging the Committee's functions. The Member added that a Members' ability to ask questions was more important than expertise.

Close

Sheriff Hayward, in the Chair, then thanked Members for their attendance and contributions, and advised that two further sessions had been scheduled, which Members present could also attend if they wished to contribute more. Members were also encouraged to make further representations via email.

Additional Comments Received

During the session, the following additional comments / points of clarification were made using the chat bar, as follows:

- A Member observed a contradiction between the desire for more transparency and many of the other recommendations made, i.e. a move to a non-Ward Committee and greater delegation. They also expressed concern about treatment of City heritage generally in the planning context.

- It was suggested that it was normal in every other planning authority for the majority of Wards to not be represented on the Planning Committee, arguing that Members represented their Ward by checking applications as they arise and making representations, as with licensing applications.
- A proposal was made to bundle wards into groupings of not less than six councillors on the “local authority” committees and then allow Wards to nominate substitute Members. Such a mechanism could provide for a committee of 12 Members and with a resultant but modest increase in overall bias towards residential wards (which tended to have more Members), excluding Aldermen, Members of property-related committees, and giving no vote to a Member on any application in their merged Ward area.
- It was commented that all Ward Members should be advised of planning inquiries and applications submitted at the earliest stage so they were fully aware of developments in their area.
- Echoing comments in relation to a large committee combatting the possibility of corruption, a Member suggested that similar arguments held in respect of bias, with the best way to dilute bias being to have a large committee/panel. The greater the number on the panel the greater the dilution for bias.
- A Member commented to counter a suggestion that some Members either opposed or supported every application that came before them, noting that opposition to several recent applications had been based on breach of planning policies.
- In support of a panel system to consider applications, a Member suggested panel membership be drawn on an ad hoc basis from the full committee. Such a panel should include any Member whose Ward was affected by the proposed application as observers, providing them an opportunity to share their views but not have voting rights. The Panel should not be fixed, but instead should have Members included on a rotational basis to ensure transparency and better representation. Finally, they argued that officers could provide technical expertise so there was no need to rely on Members with property experience, commenting that the important thing was to evaluate the application as per the national policy, the relevant local plan, and other supplementary planning documents. The role of the panel was to ensure that full scrutiny has been done in evaluating and deciding an application.

Governance Review: Member Engagement Sessions
Planning: Session 2
18 January 2021

Notes of Discussion

Present

Sheriff Christopher Hayward (in the Chair)	Deputy Edward Lord
Mark Bostock	Alderman Ian Luder
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Andy Mayer
Deputy David Bradshaw	Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Deputy Roger Chadwick	Deputy Brian Mooney
Karina Dostalova	Deputy Alastair Moss
Mary Durcan	Barbara Newman
Alderman Emma Edhem	Susan Pearson
John Edwards	Judith Pleasance
Helen Fentimen	William Pimlott
Marianne Fredericks	Deputy Elizabeth Rogula
Alderman Sir Roger Gifford	Oliver Sells
Alderman David Graves	Deputy Tom Sleigh
Graeme Harrower	Deputy John Tomlinson
Ann Holmes	Mark Wheatley
Natasha Lloyd-Owen	Deputy Philip Woodhouse

Introduction

Sheriff Hayward, in the Chair, opened the meeting and thanked Members for joining today's session. He then introduced the session, setting out the process for Member consultation on relevant aspects of the review, with documents to inform the consultation session having been circulated in advance. Sheriff Hayward then summarised the references and recommendations with Lord Lisvane's review regarding the Planning & Transportation Committee.

Prior to debating the recommendations set out by Lord Lisvane, a Member made reference to an email circulated to all Members earlier that day, in which they suggested there were legal flaws in the basis of the proposal that the Planning Committee should cease to be a Ward Committee (ref: Lisvane para. 309), whilst also observing in relation to the Planning Protocol (ref: Lisvane paras 315-316). They encouraged Members to read the passage quoted in that email from the Nolan report, together with the Transparency International report referred to.

Another Member also spoke to raise general observations on the recommendations and the Planning & Transportation Committee, suggesting that any new approach needed to be responsive to the needs of all those who used the system (whether they be applicants, objectors, or others), agile and able to take decisions quickly

where necessary, and that its decisions must have the necessary democratic legitimacy.

Recommendations: Members' Comments and Observations

Members then proceeded to debate the various recommendations.

Ward Committee status (paragraphs 269-272)

- Members articulated a wide range of opinions in respect of the continued benefits or disbenefits of Planning & Transportation remaining a Ward Committee.
- Some Members commented on the ineffective nature of such a large committee, reflecting on the significant instances of repetition and the inefficient nature of debate and decision-making as a consequence. The effective use of smaller decision-making panels as utilised across the country by other local authorities would allow for more responsive, focused, and detailed consideration of proposals, whilst also freeing up time at the grand committee level for more thoughtful scrutiny in relation to key strategic and policy items.
- Others argued that the retention of the Ward Committee format was of vital importance in ensuring the ability of elected Members to represent adequately the concerns of their constituents. The fundamentally different nature of the City as opposed to other local authority areas was highlighted, with Members observing that Ward representatives were familiar with the prospective local impacts of planning proposals in a way that Members from other parts of the City would not be.
- In relation to comments around the size of the committee necessitated by the Ward arrangements, the suggestion was made that short meetings were not necessarily desirable or a mark of efficiency, as they might curtail legitimate democratic debate; equally, it was posited that lengthy meetings were not indicative of democratic process being followed, as they might exclude many Members with less available time. A suggestion was made that more effective agenda management could be employed, with it also commented that time at meetings was often taken up with debate about process or other matters, rather than the substance of applications or strategic matters.
- Several individuals highlighted the benefits of the Ward Committee system in allowing Members to serve on committees close to voters' concerns and in taking into account the non-party political make-up of the Court. It was also suggested that a smaller non-Ward committee could make it very difficult for some Members to be elected to committees where their voters wished to be represented and that such a step could, therefore, be considered undemocratic.
- Concerns about the current size of the committee were also disputed by a Member, with it suggested that average attendance was around 25 which,

given the peculiar context and circumstances of the City, represented a reasonable number of participants.

- An argument was also advanced that it would be better to consider first the general principle of whether Ward Committees should exist at all and the criteria by which their use should be determined. Following this, individual decisions as to whether specific committees, including Planning, should be Ward or non-Ward Committees could be taken.

Strategic / Policy Framework Focus, Delegation (paragraphs 307-308)

- Several Members agreed with the proposal that there was a need for the grand committee to focus more on key questions of policy and strategy observing that, at present, most of the meeting time was taken up by consideration of applications, which meant there was little time to consider the bigger picture items which were crucial in setting the framework by which applications were considered and the future of the City was determined.
- The suggestion was made that the retention of Ward Committee status would be helpful for such a committee which was focused more on macro-level strategic issues, noting that there was a clear interest for all Wards in these items.
- A Member commented that consideration of increased delegation to officers was also sensible, to allow for the committee to focus more effectively on strategic matters.

Panel System (paragraphs 309-310)

- Several Members spoke in favour of the introduction of a panel system being introduced, particularly underneath a grand committee focused on the strategic and policy matters. They reflected on their successful use at the majority of other local authorities and the additional focus to applications they could provide, as well as being structured in such a way as to ensure their memberships could be free of any prospective conflict of interest.
- The suggestion was also made that major applications above a certain threshold could also be reserved for the grand committee.
- Other Members were firmly opposed to the establishment of panels, arguing that such an arrangement risked disenfranchising residential members. In particular, there were significant concerns that any geographically-based approach would mean local Members, who knew and understood the impact of proposed developments, were left without a voice. It was urged that such an approach not be adopted and, if it were, that site visits be mandated at a minimum.
- Advocates of the panel approach commented that this system would not preclude ward Members from representing their electorate, as they would still be able to make representations to ensure constituents' voices were

heard and, at the grand committee level, residents' views could also be fed into strategic aspect of the process. However, it was argued that it was inappropriate for Members from affected Wards to serve on panels deciding on applications, given the clear conflict of interest. The example of the Licensing Committee was suggested as a useful model to consider, with it ventured that the establishment of panels with no obvious interest or stake went to heart of questions of transparency and integrity.

- Other Members disputed the suggestion that they should not be able to participate in processes relating to matters that were of key importance to residents in their Ward, arguing that this was undemocratic and risked residents losing all faith in the planning process representing their interests fairly.
- A Member also observed that there was a difference between representing a Ward and living in it when it came to questions of potential conflict and this should be considered carefully. The differing nature of the City in relation to the types of application considered was also highlighted in this context, with it observed that there was a difference between a panel considering a series of homogeneous applications to do with minor local extensions or buildings, and the building of an extremely large office development.
- It was also observed that some Members from “business” Wards lived in “residential” Wards in the City, complicating the picture. The varying size and geography of Wards was an added complication, as in some cases it would seem unwise to prevent someone who lived at one extreme of a particular Ward from participating in debate on an application in the far end, yet not on applications in adjacent Wards which were closer geographically in reality.
- An argument was made that, if panels were to be adopted, then careful consideration must be given to their composition and how they were selected. The suggestion was made that there should be certain contingent factors to reflect the makeup of grand committee, perhaps utilising a sort of rota system to ensure a minimum number of residential members and to ensure everyone had a fair chance to serve. It was observed that, in every other local authority, councillors were all residential ward representatives; the business / residential distinction was a creation of the City itself and thus direct comparators with others needed to be made in that context.
- It was also commented that, should there be any move to a panel system, it would extremely important to ensure resident Members were provided with additional time to speak at the application stage, or were involved at an earlier stage in the process, with it noted that there must be a way permitted to allow local representatives to contribute. The fundamental democratic importance of allowing Members to represent their constituents was emphasised.

Perceptions of Conflicts / Transparency (paragraph 311-316)

- A Member highlighted recent discontent in respect of a particular planning application in respect of the City's interests. They observed that the question of potential conflict when the City Corporation was owner or developer as well as planning authority was a hugely important issue and needed to be addressed.
- A number of individuals commented on the growing lack of faith in the City's planning processes amongst residents, emphasising the importance of addressing this.
- Support was expressed for the recommendations at paragraph 316 in respect of those sitting on property committees not being eligible to serve on Planning, as well as the principle that those who served on any service committee which was the originator of a planning application also being prohibited from participation in consideration of that application.
- Several Members urged that colleagues read the Transparency International report which made a series of recommendations in relation to planning decisions and managing the perception of bias, including through prohibiting those with professional background in the property sector serving on the Planning Committee. Some Members expressed concerns around the potential loss of expertise this might risk, as well as the practical complexities in distinguishing the type of involvement with the sector or to what degree this would need to be to reach the threshold where service was barred.
- The importance of training for Members on the committee was stressed, with it argued this should be mandatory as it was in certain other authorities. It was also suggested that training would be a way of ensuring any individual Member had the requisite skills and knowledge, thereby mitigating concerns against a lack of expertise elsewhere; equally, officers' expertise should be relied upon if needed.
- Several Members stressed that the system needed to be, and be seen to be, fair, open and transparent for all participants. Robust protocols and policies would be important to this end. A Member added that this was particularly true given that there was no recourse for appeal, unlike with the licensing process where one could appeal to a magistrate.

Close

Sheriff Hayward thanked Members for their many contributions, adding that any additional points Members wished to make by email following the meeting would be welcomed.

Additional Comments received after the Engagement Session meetings

Following the meeting, the following additional comments / points of clarification were submitted by Members who had either been in attendance and wished to make additional points, or who had not been able to attend due to personal circumstances and wished for their views to be recorded:

- Several Members wrote to express their strong support for Planning remaining a Ward Committee and opposed any move away from this. In particular, they commented on the value of Ward Committees in ensuring all Members participate in committees and that all views and parts of the City were reflected in the Corporation's work, including planning.
- One Member also expressed their opposition to the introduction of any sort of panel system, while another indicated that they would not be opposed to such an arrangement provided that the parent committee was retained as a Ward Committee.
- It was argued that the Ward Committee system was an important safeguard for the delivery of planning decisions, ensuring views were heard from across the range of activities and interests in the Square Mile, whilst at the same time reflecting the national importance of its business constituents, so that there was an appropriate balance between business and residential views in decision-making. Whilst accepting there was room within the present Ward-based Planning committee to improve efficiency, and that Panels could be a part of that, any move to replace the former with the latter was unjustified and would jeopardise the existing safeguards for the business City essential to its success.
- In relation to the size of the committee, a Member cautioned against comparing directly with other authorities, observing that they were able to maintain smaller committees due to their party-political arrangements. The Corporation's independent arrangements across 25 Wards meant that this would not be practicable in the City and a reduction in size would result in a substantial disconnect from residents and their concerns.
- One Member stressed the importance in any new arrangement of consulting with residents about applications which might affect them and allowing the relevant Ward Members to be involved and to make representations. They suggested that the involvement of Members could be facilitated by allowing them to speak at a Planning meeting to make representations, as was common in the City and elsewhere, and supported the overall principle that Members should not have an interest in a decision being made.
- A Member suggested that the Licensing Committee provided a good model for a reformed Planning Committee and commented that they were unaware of any other Local Authority not having a panel system for applications, with the main committee dealing with policy and other matters. They were, therefore, minded that a panel system for applications with a grand committee for policy / strategy was the right way to proceed.
- Another Member agreed that having separate panels for planning applications addressed most of the problems currently faced by the Planning Committee,

with it observed that the Committee had significant additional business in addition to considering applications and the time currently spent on applications meant that insufficient attention and scrutiny was devoted to other important matters.

- It was felt that retaining a fairly large Planning Committee would have benefits as it would ease the creation of panels and widen participation and input into other business.
- Some concerns were expressed regarding the designation of “residential”, with it observed that many Wards did not have this designation but still had significant resident populations. Members who served in such Wards well understood resident priorities, particularly where they were also City residents themselves, and so if some committee or panel places were to be reserved for resident members, I think these should be for City resident members and not exclusively for members who represent designated 'residential wards'.
- One Member commented on the volume of paperwork at Planning meetings and recommended the mandatory use of the “mod.gov” app by Members, so as to move to a paperless arrangement. They articulated the various benefits of the app, including accessibility and easy location of particular elements of reports, and also argued against the compression of reports into a shortened or overly summarised format, arguing that any such approach would inevitably reflect the bias of the author / editor.
- With reference to concerns expressed by some around those with expertise and engagement in the property sector serving, one Member argued that such individuals’ participation should be considered a strength rather than a weakness. They observed that the City benefited from the expertise of Members that other authorities did not enjoy and advocated for transparency and recusal where there is conflict being the best system, suggesting that one should not be precluded from participation based on professional connections.
- Another Member expressed similar views, echoing the belief that individual Members should not be precluded from planning committee membership because of any professional or business involvement or involvement with other committees. They suggested that, if there was a conflict of interest, the individual should be responsible for declaring it and absenting themselves, with no further involvement in the decision-making process. In the case of a panel decision, they suggested that the application being within the Member’s Ward should preclude participation.
- Other Members queried the logic of preventing experienced Members serving on Planning when there was, throughout Lisvane, an overarching commentary around the need to use Members’ skills and experience to maximum effect. It was observed that there were several talented and experienced Members whose service to both Planning and Property committees was essential to their effective functioning; there had never been a case of improper behaviour by any Member in this regard so far as they were aware and they, therefore, opposed proposals to limit cross-membership of these committees.

- A Member stressed the need to recognise the City was of national and international importance as a financial and business centre. To maintain its pre-eminence, the City must be able to evolve and evolution required change in business terms and in the physical environment. Planning decisions and Transportation policies were key deliverables by the City Corporation, fundamental to business' ability to change. The City business vote was unique in the UK and was both a reflection of the importance of City trade and a critical factor in its growth and success; decisions taken which impacted on the business City must be seen in this national context and not constrained by parochial concerns.

Governance Review: Member Engagement Sessions
Planning: Session 3
28 January 2021

Notes of Discussion

Present

Sheriff Christopher Hayward (in the Chair)	Jeremy Mayhew
Randall Anderson	Deputy Alastair Moss
Adrian Bastow	Benjamin Murphy
Mark Bostock	Barbara Newman
Deputy David Bradshaw	Susan Pearson
Deputy Roger Chadwick	Judith Pleasance
Mary Durcan	Henry Pollard
John Edwards	James de Sausmarez
Marianne Fredericks	Oliver Sells
Graeme Harrower	Deputy Tom Sleigh
Ann Holmes	Sir Michael Snyder
Wendy Hyde	Deputy John Tomlinson
Jamie Ingham Clark	Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Natasha Lloyd-Owen	Alderman Sir David Wootton

Introduction

Sheriff Hayward, in the Chair, opened the meeting and thanked Members for joining today's session. He then introduced the discussion, setting out the process for Member consultation on relevant aspects of the review, with documents to inform the consultation session having been circulated in advance. Sheriff Hayward then summarised the references and recommendations with Lord Lisvane's review regarding the Planning & Transportation Committee.

Recommendations: Members' Comments and Observations

- A wide range of opinions in relation to the advantages and disadvantages of Planning & Transportation remaining a Ward Committee were articulated. Several Members agreed with the recommendation of the Lisvane report that the current size of the committee was much too large. The view was put forward that Ward Committees were not an efficient way of taking decisions and that smaller panels should take decisions and report directly to an overall Grand Committee. In this way, transparency and democratic legitimacy would be preserved. Members made reference to significant recent instances of repetition of views during debate at meetings, rendering such debate ineffective and hampering decision-making in consequence. Subject to effective deployment, smaller decision-making panels would allow for a more responsive and focused consideration of proposals. In turn the grand committee would be

provided the opportunity for detailed and thorough scrutiny in relation to key strategic and policy items.

- It was proposed that certain key factors should be employed in order to inform the makeup of a grand committee: the use of a rota system to ensure no positions remained permanent, a minimum number of residential members to be maintained and ensuring that all Members had an appropriate opportunity to serve on the committee.
- One Member observed that this issue had become a dominant part of the consultation process, particularly with regard to the manner in which any prospective smaller panels may be selected, given that the recommendation in the Lisvane advised against geographical selection or permanent membership. Another Member noted, however, that geographical selection could be valuable and posited that the City could be divided into three areas from which to select Members for panels, with no Member determining an application in their own area.
- Another Member proposed that a panel of five Members should be drawn from a grand committee in order to consider applications, with two of the five Members being Ward Members. The nature of the City as being fundamentally different to other local authorities was emphasised – appointments in other local authorities were political, whilst the City's appointments were not – with Members observing that Ward representatives were familiar with the intricacies involved in the applications in their wards and the prospective local impacts of planning proposals in a way that Members from other parts of the City were not.
- Other Members however argued in favour of the retention of the Ward Committee format, without panels, with the view expressed that this was of vital importance in ensuring the ability of elected Members to represent the concerns of residents appropriately. The argument was put forward that any restriction on Members' ability to carry out this function lacked democratic legitimacy and risked residents losing faith in the planning process representing their interests fairly.
- Another Member underlined that the ultimate responsibility of the City, as a key global business and financial centre, was to businesses operating in the Square Mile. In response, comment was made that the Local Plan existed in order to ensure, amongst other issues, both residents and businesses were represented adequately and that this should be the basis upon which preparation work relied.
- Another Member voiced their agreement for the 'panels' approach and emphasised that the size and shape of the current, large committee was not tenable. Several Members agreed that the debate tended to be dominated by a small number of vocal members which had the effect of making other members feel excluded. Additionally, other important agenda items were then subject to less scrutiny than warranted due to time pressure. As a result, therefore, the scheduling of a greater number of meetings would lead to no greater efficiency in terms of the decision-making process. A further Member

spoke in agreement with this view, noting that most Members who were in paid employment during the day were unable to commit one half day per fortnight to Planning meetings.

- Alternatively, another Member suggested that short meetings were not necessarily evidence of efficiency and could have the undesirable effect of curtailing legitimate democratic debate. Some Members felt, given the average attendance at Planning meetings was approximately 25 Members, that this represented a reasonable number of participants given the unique circumstances of the City.
- An argument was made that it would be better to consider first the general principle of whether Ward Committees should exist at a macro level. Several Members agreed that decision-making was less effective when conducted by Members who had been in a meeting lasting several hours. Comment was made that the two-hour time limit for meetings designated under Standing Orders was ineffective and failed to regulate impracticably long meetings as intended.
- The argument for separate Committees for strategic and policy items, and separate panels for planning applications, was reiterated. The suggestion was also made that major applications above a certain threshold could also be reserved for the grand committee.
- A Member voiced opposition to these comments and expressed the view that the length of Planning meetings altered naturally over time, with meetings being scheduled in order to meet demand. The same Member commented that the idea of 'calling-in' applications would generate too many problems and reiterated that that transparency and fairness must remain central to the process.

Close

Sheriff Hayward thanked Members for their many contributions, adding that any additional points Members wished to make by email following the meeting would be welcomed.

Additional Comments received after the Engagement Session meetings

Following the meeting, the following additional comments / points of clarification were submitted by Members who had either been in attendance and wished to make additional points, or who had not been able to attend due to personal circumstances and wished for their views to be recorded:

- Several Members wrote to express their strong support for Planning remaining a Ward Committee and opposed any move away from this. In particular, they commented on the value of Ward Committees in ensuring the process was deemed fair by applicants, objectors and members of the public.

- Regarding size, a Member added that the current number was not problematic but that Wards which do not contribute a Member should not be substituted by others to make up numbers.
- Several Members wrote to strongly oppose the introduction of panels, with some stating their reason as panel Members being difficult to select without perception of bias or considerable ongoing effort in individual panel selection. One Member however did express that the suggestion of panels may become a viable option with further consideration as to its practicality. If this were to occur, they felt that panels should not be composed of any Members with connections to the professional planning or development community due to perceived bias.
- A Member referenced others' views that a similar approach to that of the Licensing Committee would be beneficial and argued that in their experience this did not address concerns over excessive duration of meetings. They also argued that the content was variable in nature to that of Licensing and therefore this approach would not be appropriate for Planning.
- A Member felt that, due to the Corporation's organisation being non-party political, comparison with other London Boroughs and their organisation was irrelevant. This was supported by another Member who felt that the Corporation's differences should be celebrated and not compared. They went on to add that, as councillor numbers in other London Boroughs were lower than those of the City, the Planning Committee was not disproportionately large if comparing to others.
- It was expressed by some Members that while the current organisation of the committee was best, substantive and contentious applications should be considered in specifically convened meetings. It was added by one Member that this would also help address any concerns over workload burdens of serving on the committee as Members would be able to give apologies if they had nothing to add to the discussion on that particular application.
- Several Members agreed that transparency was a critical issue and stressed that this needed to be addressed. A Member added that they felt the current system lacked democratic legitimacy and that reform must focus on empowering residents and workers, and not further limiting scrutiny. Another Member felt that in particular there was a lack of confidence amongst residents as to the impartiality of the current system.
- One Member suggested this should be achieved by requiring Members to declare any interests for planning applications subject to decision. Several Members agreed with the recommendations to restrict participation in Planning committee for those who sat on committees responsible for City Corporation properties and those who had City professional property interests.
- One Member highlighted that perceived and actual bias were different and as such should be treated differently. They argued that perceived bias was most at risk of becoming actual bias in smaller panels.
- One Member circulated a letter sent to the Lord Mayor, Policy Chair and Town Clerk about the extent to which the City Corporation's planning process complies with good practice by Transparency International. They highlighted

that while the letter advised the City of London was meeting good practice, it suggested more improvement was needed in some areas. They argued that previous decisions of Members not to address this had resulted in reputational risk for the Corporation and they advised that this be considered alongside the Lisvane Review. They highlighted that Lisvane's recommendations to restrict Members of property committees from sitting on the Planning committee aligned with Transparency International's recommendations, while the introduction of panels or reducing the size of the Planning committee did not.

- A Member commented that Lisvane had an undue focus on efficiency at the expense of democracy. Given the independent structure of the Court and the particular importance attached by many voters to planning issues it was, in their view, essential to retain the Ward structure. It was also considered to be the best way of resolving the linked issues of perception of bias/increased potential for corruption.
- With regard to the efficiency of the Committee, it was suggested that this could be improved by holding shorter meetings which were dedicated to applications from specific areas e.g. City East and City West, an approach recently adopted by the Police. Other meetings could then be devoted to general issues or specific applications of huge importance. It was noted however that these changes might lead to more pressure on the Chairman - already a testing and critical role. Consequently, it was suggested that a second Deputy post could be created, with the added benefit of serving as a useful training ground for a future Chairman.
- A Member commented that in general, residents and workers had common interests and therefore they strongly opposed attempts to create a division. They noted however that there needed to be far more sensitivity to planning applications particularly close to significant clusters of residents e.g. Barbican, Golden Lane and Middlesex Street. It was suggested that, in these areas particularly, tensions were exacerbated by consistent raising of heights and increased massing. Many residents felt that the City Corporation's approach to planning matters did not reflect a commitment to residents. To reduce anguish, it was suggested that there should be restrictions on developments bordering cluster areas.

This page is intentionally left blank

Member Engagement: Planning (Lisvane Review)

From: Hayward CC, Christopher (Sheriff)
Sent: 29 January 2021 17:01
To: Chair of the Barbican Association
Subject: RE: Lisvane on Planning Barbican Association's view

Dear Adam

I am hugely grateful to you and your Association for your email and for expressing with clarity your views and concerns regarding our Planning activity in the City. As Chairman of the Lisvane Consultation process I will most definitely ensure that the views that you express are taken forward and drawn to the attention of the members of those Committees who are making the ultimate formal recommendations to the Court of Common Council. I have no doubt that your elected members will also ensure your message is heard too.

I said as recently as the last Planning Committee meeting that in my view residents are important stakeholders in the City and I accept that some of our past actions may not have necessarily given that impression. Even when we disagree, which inevitably we will do from time to time, we must be respectful of resident's views and I personally am keen to try and start a new chapter in rebuilding the relationship between us. It is in that spirit that I have offered to meet with you quarterly to better understand resident's concerns and I know that the Policy Chair is meeting with you likewise today. That offer should in no way be seen as seeking to undermine your relationship with your excellent team of elected Ward members who should always be your first point of contact.

Best wishes
Chris

Christopher M Hayward CC
Sheriff of the City of London
Deputy Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee

From: Chair of the Barbican Association
Sent: 29 January 2021 10:16
To: Hayward CC, Christopher (Sheriff)
Subject: Lisvane on Planning Barbican Association's view

Dear Chris

When we last talked, you mentioned that you thought that relations between the City and its residents were not as good as they had been in the past. We endorsed that view.

You also updated us on how the City was responding to the Lisvane Governance report. Planning was next on the Agenda.

We definitely support Lisvane's proposals that the Planning Committee should follow best practice in reducing conflicts of interest and the perception of them, and we accept that there are statutory limits on how much ward councillors can do on the committee to represent the interests of their constituents. However, we do think that residents come off particularly badly from the current planning regime.

Recent planning decisions, the most recent being 150 Aldersgate, (other examples are presented as an appendix below), where sufficient attention to residents' views, Conservation Area rules and the Local Plan did not appear to have been paid, have not helped City resident relations. Indeed, there appears to be a culture that pays virtually no attention to residents and renders the planning policies that protect residential amenity, listed buildings and Conservation Areas meaningless because they are always trumped by other policies.

In the BA's response to Lisvane, we said "Residents should have a stronger voice than currently and stronger than that of workers or visitors because we are more heavily invested in the City and what the City does affects our lives more." The BA represents about half of all the residents in the City and planning decisions impact on us 24 hours a day and for many years.

We hope that in your deliberations you will take full account of residential needs. We will be seeking further protection in the Local Plan during the next round of consultation in view of the City's unique structural imbalance against residential interests.

Adam Hogg Chairman Barbican Association
Jane Smith Chairman PA Planning Group

Appendix

Further examples of planning committee decisions that simply ignore residents' concerns or their rights to some amenity. These range

From the small scale – e.g., the decision to grant 21 Moorfields’ request to vary their originally consented scheme to move their delivery bay from Fore Street Avenue to Moor Lane. The City’s own traffic engineers had approved a delivery bay on Fore Street Avenue, certifying that it could cope with the traffic flows. The City approved its movement to Moor Lane, which is overlooked by all the flats in Willoughby House and is itself designated as a quiet cycleway with a City plan for greening and public realm enhancements.

To the medium scale: an unwillingness to do anything about building managers’ delight in 24 hour a day lit-up building, leading to light pollution for residential neighbours (and incidentally wasting energy).

To the large scale: multiple approvals for buildings surrounding the Barbican estate that are more massive and much higher than the buildings they replace, leading to cumulative losses of daylight and sunlight, and a persistent refusal to recognise that even though the loss might be less than the BREAM limit of 20% that is still a loss and it is compounded by successively higher buildings- Tenter House, 21 Moorfields, London Wall Place Nos 1 and 2, No 1 London Wall; 140, 150, 160 Aldersgate Street; the Denizen.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

Committee(s)	Dated:
Planning and Transportation - for information Resource Allocation Sub Committee - for information	16 February 2021 17 February 2021
Subject: Local Implementation Plan - Transport for London funded schemes 2020/21	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	9. We are digitally and physically well-connected and responsive. 12. Our spaces are secure, resilient and well-maintained.
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	£
What is the source of Funding?	Transport for London
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Y
Report of: Director of DBE	For Information
Report author: Samantha Tharme	

Summary

This report covers the provision of Transport for London funding to the City of London Corporation. It seeks approval for the re-allocation of funds within the financial year.

The allocation for 2020/21 was approved at RASC on 17 October 2019. The reallocation is within the £100,000 threshold which can be approved by Director for Department of the Built Environment.

These projects will help deliver the road safety, public realm and transport management objectives of current Local Implementation Plan and the Corporations Transport Strategy.

In April all TfL funding was paused to prioritise funding for Covid-19 response measures. In November Transport for London (TfL) were able to release some Local Implementation Plan (£368k) and Liveable Neighbourhood (£150k) funding for the remainder of 2020/21. This is approximately a third of the previously agreed Local Implementation Plan (LIP) programme for the year. Those schemes which are part way through delivery and have necessary approvals were prioritised for completion this financial year. All other schemes within the LIP remain on pause until further funding decisions are made.

For the current financial year 2020/21, it is requested to reallocate a total of £95,000 as set out in table 1, to priority schemes which can be delivered in the current financial year.

Recommendation(s)

- Approve reallocations within 2020/21 to a total of £95,000 as set out in table 1, for the EV charge point enabling works, Healthy Streets minor schemes and Puddle Dock pedestrian route scheme.

Main Report

Background

1. Under Section 159 of the Greater London Authority Act 1999, TfL is empowered to provide grants to London boroughs and the City for the provision of safe, efficient and economically viable transportation facilities and (or) services to, from or within Greater London. In May 2019 the 3 year Local Implementation Plan for the City was submitted to TfL and approved.
2. For the 2020/21 financial year TfL agreed the following grants to the City of London:
 - A combined grant of £100,000 for Local Transport Initiatives and £867,000 under the Corridors, Neighbourhoods and Supporting Measures and Local Transport Initiatives programmes.
 - £105,000 under the Principal Road Maintenance funding programme.
 - Additional funding through the discretionary, Liveable Neighbourhoods programme allocated £200,000 in 2020/21.
3. Spending against these projects was approved in October 2019.
4. In April 2020 Transport for London were required to pause all 2020/21 funding, in order to prioritise spend on emergency Covid-19 response measures.

Current Position

5. A decision to release funds (£368k) for the remainder of 2020/21 has now been possible as TfL have secured a financial package with central government. This is approximately a third of the previously agreed programme for the year. The spend will focus on schemes that are essential and high priority against current Corporate objectives; furthermore, given approval stages are able to progress and deliver within this financial year. These are to:
 - Complete delivery of the City' Corporation's elements of the Puddle Dock scheme.
 - Deliver three Healthy Streets minor schemes to improve the experience and safety of people walking at Old Broad Street by Pinners Passage, Creechurch Lane by Leadenhall Street and Gresham Street by Wood Street.
 - Scope opportunities for further pavement widening and pedestrian priority within the Healthy Streets programme, in line with the Transport strategy and Climate Action Strategy;

- Install barriers at Baynard House Car Park as part of the delivery of the rapid charging hub, in support of the Electric Vehicle Charging infrastructure plan.

6. £150,000 of Liveable Neighbourhood funding has also been released for the City Cluster Area Programme.

Proposals

7. Table 1 shows the reallocated amount under the Local Transport Initiatives and the updated allocations for programmes of work within the Corridors and Neighbourhoods and Liveable Neighbourhoods Programme.

Table 1: Approved Annual Spending Submission (ASS) for 2020/21 and revised allocation as at November 2020.		
	Approved Allocation Oct 2019 (£)	Revised Allocation Nov 2020 (£)
Local Transport Initiatives		
ZEZ City Cluster; Barbican/Golden Lane	50,000	-
City-wide 15mph – scheme development	50,000	-
Electric Vehicle charge point enabling works	-	40,000
Healthy Streets minor schemes	-	10,000
Sub Total	100,000	50,000
Corridor, Neighbourhoods & Supporting Measures		
Healthy Streets minor schemes	130,000	103,000
Legible London City-wide Roll Out	257,000	-
Puddle Dock Pedestrian safety and route severance scheme	170,000	215,000
Mansion House Station walking and public realm improvements	60,000	-
100 Minorities public realm enhancements	40,000	-
Road Danger Reduction campaigns, behaviour change & engagement	90,000	-
Lunchtime Streets	60,000	-
Thames Riverside Walkway – Globe View section	60,000	-
Sub total	867,000	318,000
Liveable Neighbourhoods		
City Cluster Scheme*	200,000	150,000
Sub Total	200,000	150,000
Central London Cycling Grid		
City Cycleways Programme	1,400,000	-
Sub Total	1,400,000	-
Principal Road Renewal	105,000	102,000
Mayors Air Quality Fund	50,000	50,000
GRAND TOTAL	2,722,000	670,000

*n.b. for the City Cluster, the committee report (Oct 2019) included total for all funding sources, this is the TfL only funding for this scheme.

8. Alternative funding sources have been identified for some projects, as reported to Planning & Transportation committee on the 15th December 2020. All other LIP funding is on pause pending further decisions for TfL.
9. In November of each year it is usual for London Authorities to submit their bid for TfL Local Implementation Plan funding for the subsequent financial year the Annual Spending Submission (ASS). This year however TfL are not asking for the ASS as they have not yet indicated what funding will be available for 2021/22.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

10. Delivery of the Transport Strategy supports the delivery of Corporate Plan outcomes 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12. It also indirectly supports the delivery of Corporate Plan outcomes 2 and 4.
11. Delivery of the Transport Strategy also helps mitigate corporate risks CR20 – Road Safety and CR21 – Air Quality.
12. Schemes within the Healthy Streets schemes are prioritised to help deliver the Climate Action Strategy.

Conclusion

13. It is requested that the reallocation is agreed to support delivery of those programmes which have approval and will complete this year and to support delivery of the EV infrastructure programme, which has mostly been funded by TfL. This funding is required to be spent in the current financial year.

Report author

Samantha Tharme Transport Planner, Department of the Built Environment.

E: Samantha.tharme@cityoflondon.gov.uk

T: 07542 228918

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