



Policy and Resources Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 17 FEBRUARY 2022

Time: 1.45 pm

Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

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

Enquiries: Polly Dunn
polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting

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

≤ <https://youtu.be/OSsM1d5HBWo> ≥

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. APOLOGIES

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

3. MINUTES

To consider minutes as follows:-

- a) To agree the public minutes and non public summary of the Policy and Resources Committee Meeting held on 20th January 2022 (Pages 9 - 20)
- b) To note the public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 15 December 2021 (Pages 21 - 30)
- c) To note the draft public minutes of the Project Sub-committee meeting held on 25 January 2022 (Pages 31 - 34)
- d) To note the draft public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 14 January 2022 (Pages 35 - 38)
- e) To note a summary of the Competitiveness Advisory Board meeting held on 13th January 2022 (Pages 39 - 40)
- f) To Note the draft public minutes of the PR Sub-committee meeting held on 24th January 2022 (Pages 41 - 44)

4. BECKFORD & CASS STATUES INTERPRETATION PROJECT

Report of the Director of Innovation & Growth.

For Decision
(Pages 45 - 52)

5. OPPORTUNITY LONDON CAMPAIGN

Joint report of the City Surveyor and Director of Environment.

For Decision
(Pages 53 - 58)

6. ESTABLISHING A MEMBERSHIP BODY TO BOOST SOCIO-ECONOMIC DIVERSITY AT SENIOR LEVELS IN UK FINANCIAL SERVICES

Report of the Director of Innovation & Growth.

For Decision
(Pages 59 - 66)

7. **SUPPORT FOR FINANCIAL AND LITERACY INCLUSION CAMPAIGN**

Report of the Director of Communications and External Affairs.

For Decision
(Pages 67 - 70)

8. **FRANCO-BRITISH YOUNG LEADERS' PROGRAMME - GALA DINNER 2022**

Report of the Director of Communications and External Affairs.

For Decision
(Pages 71 - 74)

9. **CITY CORPORATION CONTRIBUTION TO LONDON TOURISM RECOVERY
MARKETING (INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN)**

Report of the Director of Innovation and Growth.

For Decision
(Pages 75 - 80)

10. **COMMONWEALTH GAMES BATON RELAY CELEBRATIONS**

Report of the Director of Communications.

For Decision
(Pages 81 - 84)

11. **PENSION COMMITTEE - PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE, MEMBERSHIP
AND OPERATION**

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Decision
(Pages 85 - 92)

12. **STANDING ORDERS**

Report of the Town Clerk (TO FOLLOW).

For Decision

13. **BILL FOR AN ACT OF COMMON COUNCIL (ALDERMANIC ELIGIBILITY)**

Report of the Comptroller and City Solicitor (TO FOLLOW).

For Decision

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

Report of the Chamberlain (TO FOLLOW).

For Information

15. **ANTI-TERRORISM TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

Report of the Director of Environment.

For Information

(Pages 93 - 98)

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

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information

(Pages 99 - 102)

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

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

19. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda

20. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

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

- a) To agree the non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 20th January 2022 (Pages 103 - 110)

- b) To note the draft non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-committee meeting held on 14 January (Pages 111 - 112)
- c) To note the non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 15 December 2021 (Pages 113 - 122)
- d) To note the non-public minutes of the Project Sub-Committee meeting held on 25th January 2022 (Pages 123 - 128)
- e) To note the draft non public minutes of the Hospitality Working Party meeting held on 20 January 2022 (Pages 129 - 134)

21. **ENABLING WORKS TO DAGENHAM DOCK DEVELOPMENT**

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Decision
(Pages 135 - 140)

22. **WAIVER REPORT: ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES (DAVE 2) TO DAGENHAM DOCK DEVELOPMENT**

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Decision
(Pages 141 - 146)

23. **CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME (CWP) AND ADDITIONAL RESOURCES FOR CITY FUND PROPERTIES (ARCFP) REQUEST FOR FUNDING FOR 2022/2023**

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Decision
(Pages 147 - 160)

24. **SECURE CITY PROGRAMME DELEGATION REQUEST**

Joint report of the Director of Environment and Commissioner, City of London Police.

For Decision
(Pages 161 - 168)

25. **SPITALFIELDS MARKET COMMUNITY TRUST - UPDATE**

Report of the Comptroller & City Solicitor.

For Decision
(Pages 169 - 174)

26. **NON-HOSPITALITY FUNDING RELATED TO PLATINUM JUBILEE EVENTS IN JUNE 2022**

Joint report of the Remembrancer and Director of Environment.

For Decision
(Pages 175 - 178)

27. **CITY FUND PROPERTY INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO - ANNUAL UPDATE & STRATEGY REPORT**

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Information
(Pages 179 - 202)

28. **CITY'S ESTATE: ANNUAL UPDATE & 2022 STRATEGY**

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Information
(Pages 203 - 220)

29. **STRATEGIC PROPERTY ESTATE (CITY FUND & CITY'S ESTATE) ANNUAL UPDATE & STRATEGY FOR 2022**

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Information
(Pages 221 - 230)

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

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

Part 3 - Confidential

32. **MINUTES**

For Decision

- a) To agree the confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 20th January 2022.

- b) To note the confidential minutes of the Projects Sub-committee meeting held on 15 December 2021

33. **DESTINATION CITY - STRATEGIC REVIEW INDEPENDENT REVIEW REPORT - GROWTH BID**

Report of the Director of Innovation and Growth.

For Decision

34. **TARGET OPERATING MODEL PROPOSAL - CITY SURVEYOR'S DEPARTMENT (CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT & ENABLING SERVICES)**

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Decision

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

Joint report of the City Surveyor, Major Programmes Director, Chief Operating Officer, Markets Director and Chamberlain.

For Decision

36. **CONFIDENTIAL RESOLUTION TO FINANCE COMMITTEE AND POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE (FROM DIGITAL SERVICES SUB-COMMITTEE)**

For Decision

37. **CONFIDENTIAL DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE **Thursday, 20 January 2022**

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held as a hybrid meeting in Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall and via Microsoft Teams and livestreamed at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PozKEgEwtKg> on Thursday, 20 January 2022 at 1.45 pm

N.B. This meeting was held as an informal one, with the views reached by the Committee formally approved by the Town Clerk after the meeting, in accordance with the Court of Common Council's Covid Approval Procedure. This process reflects the current position in respect of the holding of formal Local Authority meetings and the Court's decision of 16 December 2021 to continue with virtual meetings, with formal confirmation of decisions provided through a delegation to the Town Clerk after the informal meeting has taken place and the will of the Committee is known.

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)
Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman)
Deputy Keith Bottomley (Vice-Chairman)
Deputy Tom Sleigh (Vice-Chair)
Rehana Ameer
Nicholas Bensted-Smith (Ex-Officio Member)
Tijs Broeke
Mary Durcan
Anne Fairweather
Marianne Fredericks
Alderman Timothy Hailes
Caroline Haines
Deputy Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Shravan Joshi
Deputy Edward Lord
Alderman Ian Luder
Alderman & Sheriff Nicholas Lyons
Jeremy Mayhew
Andrew McMurtrie
Wendy Mead
Deputy Andrien Meyers
Deputy Brian Mooney (Chief Commoner) (Ex-Officio Member)
Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy James Thomson (Ex-Officio Member)
Mark Wheatley
Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Alderman Sir David Wootton

Officers:

John Barradell - Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Michael Cogher - Comptroller and City Solicitor
Paul Double - City Remembrancer

Paul Wilkinson	- City Surveyor
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- The Chamberlain
Damian Nussbaum	- Director of Innovation & Growth
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk
Greg Moore	- Assistant Town Clerk
Polly Dunn	- Town Clerk's Department
Chris Rumbles	- Town Clerk's Department
Eugenie de Naurois	- Head of Corporate Affairs
Andrew Carter	- Director of Community and Children's Services
Nicholas Gill	- Investment Property Director
Dominic Barker	- Speechwriter to the Policy Chair
Emma Moore	- Chief Operating Officer and Acting Deputy Town Clerk
Anna Dunne	- City Surveyor's Department
Simi Shah	- Innovation & Growth Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Ruby Sayed and the Rt Hon The Lord Mayor Alderman Vincent Keaveny.

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

The Deputy Chairman confirmed he had a declaration in respect of an item in the confidential part of the agenda, which he would make at the appropriate point in the meeting.

3. **MINUTES**

- a) The public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 16 December 2021.

Matters arising

Electoral Registration – Alderman Tim Hailes observed that the wording used might give the false impression that he had been opposed to the policy decision not to enfranchise staff at this point in time; rather, he had been in agreement with the Committee that changing the arrangements would not be appropriate at this point in time, but had expressed his view that this should not constitute a permanent policy position and should be properly reconsidered at an appropriate point in time, with it being positive for the City Corporation to do so. The Alderman asked that the minute be amended to accurately reflect this position, as did Edward Lord and Tijs Broeke to reflect their similar positions.

RESOLVED: That the public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 16th December 2021 be approved subject to the above clarification being included.

- b) The draft public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 December 2021 were noted.

At this point in the meeting, it was agreed that item 14 (“Any the business which the Chair considers urgent”) should be taken, given the latest Government announcement relating to Covid-19 restrictions being lifted.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT

Urgent Item: Informal / Virtual Meetings

The Chair remarked on how she was sure all Members would share in her delight at seeing Covid-19 restrictions being lifted and the opportunity this presented to start seeing people returning to the Square Mile once again. The Chair added how this provided an opportune moment to think again regarding the City Corporation’s meeting arrangements moving forwards. The Chair proposed reverting back to normal meeting arrangements and lifting the Covid Approval Procedure, with this taking effect from Thursday 27th January 2022 to allow reasonable notice to be given to Members who may have already made arrangements for meetings in the interim period.

Members acknowledged that reverting to normal meeting arrangements would prevent them from participating virtually in Local Authority meetings, whilst noting they would still be able to observe meetings virtually should they wish to do so.

There was unanimous support for a return to business as usual, with a number of Members suggesting a need for flexibility to allow virtual participation in meetings where possible. It was suggested that Chairs would need to follow a pragmatic approach at their meetings.

The Comptroller responded and reminded Members that the position regarding virtual participation in Local Authority meetings was not one of the City Corporation’s own making, with Government refusing to extend legislation that allowed for this. As things stand, the position remains that Members have to attend physically to participate in Local Authority meetings, which means non-participation and there being a limited opportunity for contributing when joining online. The Comptroller suggested that the pragmatic, risk-based approach proposed for participation in items, whereby some discretion be exercised when considering ‘information’ items and any business at a non-decision-making sub-committee, may best be avoided. This was because it would run the risk of legal challenge in certain committees, especially as Members were likely to want to speak to more controversial items.

The Chair proposed appropriate guidance be offered to Chairs and sought Members’ agreement to reverting to normal meeting arrangements, effective from 27th January 2022.

RESOLVED: That Members agree to the removal of Covid-19 Approval Procedure and a return to normal Committee meeting arrangements, taking effect from Thursday 27th January 2022.

The Chief Operating Officer and Acting Deputy Town Clerk took the opportunity to update Members on the proposed two stage process for a return of staff to the workplace. From 31st January 2022 staff would be asked to return to the office at least two days a week, moving to at least three days in the workplace by the end of February. Use of QR codes was to be removed, face coverings would continue to be elective and capacity limits in meeting rooms would also end.

The Chair concluded the item and remarked on how it would be good to start seeing more people back in the City.

4. **CAPITAL FUNDING – PRIORITISATION OF 2022/23 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS – STAGE 2 FINAL PROPOSALS**

The Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain presenting Capital Bids – Stage 2 final proposals.

It was noted that the St Paul's Gyrotory bid was approved under delegated authority.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Note the revised total value of 2022/23 bids of £45.6m (subject to final confirmation).
- Agree that the revised bids relating to three schemes detailed in paragraph 6 be rated as green, noting the final approval of the amount for the St Paul's Gyrotory revised bid that had been granted under delegated authority.
- Confirm the proposed final RAG rating of £26.2m green, £12.6m amber and £6.8m red (detailed in the appendices).
- Agree that funding for the green bids of £26.1m be agreed in principle and incorporated into the medium-term financial plans of City Fund and City's Cash (noting that the balance of £0.1m has already been agreed by the BHE Board).
- Note that amber and red bids will be deferred with amber-rated bids to be placed on a reserve list to be progressed if savings are later identified from the provisions for green bids.
- Agree that the financial disciplines currently in place be continued, whereby
 - central funding will be withdrawn for schemes that slip by more than one year; and
 - the 'one-in, one-out' approach to funding of bids outside of the annual process be operated.
- Agree to the carry- over of the unallocated provision of £27.7m of loan facilities previously agreed for the Police and HRA.

5. **DEPARTMENTAL 2022/23 BUDGET ESTIMATES**

The Committee considered a revised revenue budget for 2021/22 and the proposed revenue budget for 2022/23 in relation to the services directly overseen by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Approve the Deputy Town Clerk's, Remembrancer's, Executive Director of Innovation and Growth's and City Surveyor's proposed revenue budgets for 2022/23 for submission to the Finance Committee;
- Approve the Deputy Town Clerk and Remembrancer Department's proposed capital and supplementary revenue projects budgets for 2022/23 for submission to Finance Committee;
- Authorise the Chamberlain, in consultation with the Deputy Town Clerk, Remembrancer, Executive Director of Innovation and Growth and the City Surveyor to revise these budgets to allow for any further implications arising from Corporate Projects, Target Operating Model (TOM) savings, other reviews and changes to the Cyclical Works Programme; and
- Agree that minor amendments for 2021/22 and 2022/23 budgets arising during budget setting be delegated to the Chamberlain.

6. **DRAFT TOWN CLERK'S CORPORATE & MEMBERS SERVICES BUSINESS PLAN FOR 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk presenting a Business Plan for Corporate and Members Services for 2022/23.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Approve the departmental Business Plan for Town Clerk's Corporate and Members Services for 2022/23 (the elements therein that fall within this committee's Terms of Reference).

7. **DRAFT COMMUNICATIONS TEAM BUSINESS PLAN FOR 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Communications presenting a Business Plan for the Communications Team for 2022/23.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Approve the Business Plan for the Communications Team for 2022/23.

8. **DRAFT INNOVATION & GROWTH BUSINESS PLAN 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation & Growth presenting a Business Plan for Innovation & Growth for 2022/23.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Note the factors taken into consideration in compiling the Innovation & Growth Business Plan; and

- Approve the departmental Business Plan for Innovation & Growth for 2022/23 (the elements that fall within this committee's Terms of Reference)

9. **DRAFT REMEMBRANCER'S OFFICE BUSINESS PLAN FOR 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report of the Remembrancer presenting a Business Plan for Remembrancer's Office for 2022/23.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Approve the departmental Business Plan for the Remembrancer's Office for 2022/23.

10. **QUARTER 3 UPDATE ON CLIMATE ACTION**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk reporting the results of the planned quarter 3 review of the inaugural year of the Climate Action Strategy (CAS).

The Vice Chair welcomed the progress against CAS year 1 plans to date. The Vice Chair commented on the Centre for Excellence as being essential to delivery of key CAS targets and noted that there had been a delay in establishing this. The Vice Chair sought reassurance on the establishment of a Centre for Excellence, to which the Climate Action Project Director responded confirming a key condition of the CAS was to deliver and execute. Members were assured that design partnership issues with the provider had now been resolved and that a Centre for Excellence would be up and running by 1st February 2022.

A Member, also Chairman of Finance Committee, referred to the project spend to date being under what had originally been budgeted for and suggested with it being a multi-year programme that these amounts would need to flow forward into future years to allow catch up in areas of underspend. Members noted that the underspend was as a result of achieving efficiencies in certain areas and through project delays, with these areas being reflected in the regular updates moving forward.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Note the progress, risks and issues arising between October to December 2021 of year 1 of implementing the Climate Action strategy.
- Approve delegated authority for approval of the initial Y2 plans and budget.

11. **PIF BID - SUMMIT ON IMPACT INVESTING**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth proposing a one-day Summit on Impact Innovation ("Impact Summit") to be hosted by the Lord Mayor and an allocation of funding from the Policy Initiatives Fund in support.

The Chair welcomed the proposal and confirmed that she was very supportive of the bid, noting it aligned with the Mayoral Theme, "People and Purpose".

The Chair did, however, highlight that the Impact Summit was also in keeping with key corporate policy. With this in mind, the Chair proposed a collaborative 'one team' approach, with the event being jointly hosted by the Lord Mayor and Chair of Policy, which received the support of Members.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Agree to the Impact Summit being a jointly hosted event by the Lord Mayor and Chair of Policy: and
- Approve £100,000 being allocated from the 2021/22 PIF budget to ensure high quality delivery of the 2022 Impact Summit. This will only be drawn on if sponsor commitments do not cover the full costs of the Impact Summit.

12. SPONSORSHIP FOR THINK TANK REPORT ON 'LEVELLING UP'

The Committee considered a report proposing the City Corporation sponsor the Centre for London's report into the Government's levelling up agenda and its impact on London.

The Chair confirmed for complete clarity that she was briefly a trustee of the Centre for London, but was no longer.

A Member referred to the narrative on levelling up being focussed on north versus south, but with there also being significant areas of socio-economic challenge and poverty in Greater London that needed bringing into public discourse and addressed, which the Chair acknowledged as something the City Corporation needed to be mindful of in its work and communications in this area.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Agree to an allocation of £35,000 from the 2021/22 Policy Initiatives Fund towards a research proposal on levelling-up by the Centre for London.

13. LONDON COUNCILS GRANTS SCHEME

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk presenting total expenditure to be incurred under the London Councils Grants Scheme and also the City Corporation's contribution to it.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Approve the total amount of expenditure to be incurred in 2022/23 under the Scheme (£6.668m) and to the City Corporation's subscription for 2022/23 (£8,102) as set out in Appendices A and B of this report; and
- subject to the Court of Common Council's approval (as levying body for the Scheme), the levy of £6.668m (as set out in Appendix B) be agreed.

14. ELECTORAL ENGAGEMENT UPDATE

The Committee received a report of the Chief Operating Officer and Acting Deputy Town Clerk updating on the work undertaken prior to the Ward List registration deadline on 16 December 2021 and presenting findings to be addressed in future campaigns.

The Chair welcomed the update and put on record her thanks to the Electoral Engagement Team for all the work they had done to date.

It was noted that the figures quoted within paragraph 5 within the report had not been finalised, although officers did not think it would differ significantly.

A Member noted the Ward List currently stood at c19,000 voters and this appeared to offer a very fragile mandate. The Member questioned whether it was time to start looking at what could be done to improve this, including a request that the City look at alternative voting systems e.g., electronic voting. It was consequently stressed that electronic voting was a wider issue beyond the City, and one that required changes to primary legislation. Electronic voting formed part of an experiment being undertaken by Central Government. Whilst this particular matter would need to be addressed eventually, it was felt that now was not an appropriate time.

A Member referred to the numbers eligible to register and that voting day was likely to see a turnout of 35%, which would weaken the mandate even further.

The Deputy Chairman put forward a personal view that these were not considerations for the meeting today but should form part of a broader review to be taken in the round following the City-wide Common Council elections in March 2022. This would allow an opportunity to understand lessons learned and to address these in advance of the next Ward elections in three years' time. This suggestion was supported by Members.

Following a question about what more could be done to encourage turnout on voting day, the Chair stressed that it was the responsibility of Members rather than City Corporation Officers, to be out in their wards encouraging people to vote.

Edward Lord put forward a motion that there be a review of electoral matters, to commence during the year immediately following the City wide elections being held in March 2022, which Brian Mooney seconded.

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

15. COP26 UPDATE

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Innovation & Growth proving an update on activity to deliver the City Corporation's high-level ambitions as part of GHS@COP26.

The Chair put on record her thanks to the Green Finance Institute, noting that it showed the City at its best and acknowledging that the City Corporation's

finance hub would not have had the same reach and impact without their invaluable contribution.

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

16. FRASER IMPLEMENTATION INTERIM UPDATE

The Committee received a report of the Director of Innovation & Growth setting out progress against the recommendations of the Fraser Review of Competitiveness.

The Chair stressed a need to continue working corporately and as one team on this important agenda.

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

17. POLICY INITIATIVES FUND AND COMMITTEE CONTINGENCY

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

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

18. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT - REVIEW OF 5 YEAR PLAN

The Committee received a report presenting a review of the 5-year finance plan for the House Revenue Account (HRA).

The Chair confirmed this paper related to a discussion later on the agenda at item 23 Water Recharge Refunds for Secure Tenants.

A Member, also Chairman of Housing Management and Almshouses Subcommittee (HM&ASC) welcomed what she considered to be an excellent report. The Member referred to a full discussion having already taken place at HM&ASC and Community and Children's Services Committee on the issue of water recharges. The Member did not consider it appropriate to bring the item to Policy and Resources Committee for consideration in an effort to overturn the decision that had already taken, simply because a Member did not like the decision reached.

A Member, also Chairman of Finance Committee, acknowledged the Member's point noting the detailed discussion and wide-ranging debate that took place at HM&ASC, recognising the financial risk and acknowledging the HRA at the moment was properly funded and the risks around it understood.

A Member suggested there would benefit in receiving a report setting out the weak state of the HRA and pressures it would face in the coming years. The Member suggested officers be tasked with providing a report setting out the pros and cons of transferring council owned property into a Housing Association.

There was support for this proposal, with it suggested that there was a need to understand the ability of the HRA to be able to borrow and what this would mean for the financial stability of the fund. Where the HRA was constrained, were there alternative options e.g. setting up separate vehicle or potentially transferring the housing estate to a much larger Housing Association? It was suggested all options needed exploring. A Member sought clarity on the budget deficit of the HRA, with an options appraisal needed.

The Chair suggested the final two points raised were questions for the HM&ASC to consider. It was agreed that a copy of the minute of this item be submitted to HM&ASC.

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

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

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

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

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

There were no questions.

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

Resource Allocation Sub-committee (RASC) appointment – the Chair referred to a vacancy on RASC caused by Karina Dostalova's recent departure from the Court. Members noted that only one meeting of RASC remained in this municipal year and were minded not to fill the vacancy for such a short period.

RESOLVED: That Members agreed to the vacant position on Resource Allocation Sub-committee remaining vacant for the final meeting in the municipal year being held on 3rd February 2022.

22. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

23. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

- a) The non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 16 December 2021 were approved.

- b) The draft non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 December 2021 were noted.
- c) The draft non-public minutes of the Hospitality Working Party meeting held on 23 November 2021 were noted.
24. **OVERALL FINANCIAL POSITION AND MEDIUM-TERM FINANCIAL PLAN**
The Committee considered a report outlining the financial position and medium-term financial plan for City Fund and City Cash.
25. **WATER CHARGE REFUNDS FOR SECURE TENANTS**
The Committee considered a report of the Director of Community and Children's Services presenting information on water charge refunds for secure tenants.
26. **GUILDHALL COMPLEX - REFURBISHMENT OPTIONS FOR THE NORTH AND WEST WINGS**
The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor presenting options for the refurbishment of Guildhall Complex North and West Wings.
27. **CITY FUND - LEADENHALL MARKET COVID 19 FUND BID**
The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor presenting a Leadenhall Market Covid-19 Fund bid.
28. **DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**
The Committee received a report updating on decisions taken between meetings under delegated or urgency powers.
29. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
30. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED.**
- State of the City Report** - Members received an update on the ongoing work on a State of the City report.
- COP26** - Members received an update on work following COP26 and what was being done to deliver on this important agenda.
31. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**
The Confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 16th December 2021 were approved.
32. **MARKETS CO-LOCATION PROGRAMME - PROGRESS REPORT AND BUDGET REQUEST**

The Committee considered a joint report of the City Surveyor, Project Governance Director, Chief Operating Officer, Markets Director and Chamberlain updating on progress with the Markets Co-location Programme.

33. TARGET OPERATING MODEL PROPOSAL - CITY SURVEYOR'S DEPARTMENT (CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT & ENABLING SERVICES)

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor setting out Target Operating Model proposals for the City Surveyor's Department relating to enabling services.

34. TOM & GOVERNANCE REVIEW: GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC & DRAMA

The Committee considered a report of the interim Principal of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama presenting Target Operating Model and Governance Review proposals relating to Guildhall School of Music and Drama.

35. TOM & GOVERNANCE REVIEW: BARBICAN CENTRE

The Committee received a report of the Managing Director of the Barbican Centre setting out Target Operating Model and Governance Reviews proposals for the Barbican Centre.

The meeting ended at 4.15pm

Chair

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

PROJECTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Wednesday, 15 December 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.00 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)	Susan Pearson
Randall Anderson	John Petrie
Caroline Haines	James de Sausmarez
Christopher Hayward	Deputy Philip Woodhouse

Officers:

Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk
Rohit Paul	- Town Clerk's Department
Bridget Danso	- Town Clerk's Department
Dianne Merrifield	- Chamberlain's Department
Paul Wilkinson	- City Surveyor
Martin O'Regan	- City of London Police
Savita Kardam	- City of London Police
Jason Preece	- City of London Police
Melanie Charalambous	- Environment Department
Clarisse Tavin	- Environment Department
Leah Coburn	- Environment Department
James Aggio-Brewe	- Environment Department
Daniel Laybourn	- Environment Department
Jonathan Cooper	- City Surveyor's Department
Emma Cunnington	- Town Clerk's Department
Jeremy Dagley	- Open Spaces Department
Declan Gallagher	- Open Spaces Department
Gillian Howard	- Environment Department
Ian Hughes	- Environment Department
Ruth Kocher	- Environment Department
Fiona McKeith	- City Surveyor's Department
James Murray	- City Surveyor's Department
Ola Obadara	- City Surveyor's Department
Kristian Turner	- Environment Department
Sonia Virdee	- Chamberlain's Department
Clive Whittle	- Environment Department

The Deputy Chairman, in the Chair, welcomed all those in attendance and members of the public observing via YouTube to the meeting.

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Keith Bottomley (Chairman), Rehana Ameer, Andrew McMurtrie, Deputy Catherine McGuinness and Deputy Philip Woodhouse.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **GATEWAY APPROVAL PROCESS**

RESOLVED – That the Gateway Approval Process be received.

4. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 17 November 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.

5. **PUBLIC ACTIONS**

The Sub Committee received a report of the Town Clerk regarding public actions and noted the updates in respect of outstanding items. The Town Clerk advised that there were around 50 projects with outstanding Gateway 6 reports. Most of these were expected to be submitted within the next 6 months, with Corporate Projects Board to receive regular updates on the matter.

RESOLVED - That the public actions list be received.

6. **GATEWAY 5 - BANK JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS: ALL CHANGE AT BANK**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 5 report of the Executive Director of Environment regarding the Bank Junction Improvements project. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report, providing a general update on the project before outlining the proposals and drawing Members' attention to the key points. The Sub Committee noted the recommendation to agree Option 1 subject to confirmation of the required funding, with Option 2 to be progressed if the funding was not secured.

The Deputy Chairman, in the Chair, commented that this was a pragmatic approach which took account of the pressures of time and inflation, noting that Option 1 was preferred with a contingency to avoid delay to the project. The Sub Committee noted that the recommendations had been approved by the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee. A Member commented that the options presented were preferable to pausing the project, as measures were needed in place in time for the completion of upgrades to Bank Station.

In response to a question from the Deputy Chairman, the Chamberlain confirmed that the confirmation of funding was subject to the outcome of a Capital Bid request for 2022/23.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee approve (subject to the outcome of the Capital Bid request for 2022/23):

1. The revised project budget of £6,677,930;
 2. Note the total estimated cost of the project (for the base scheme and some enhancement) is now £6.7 million of which currently £1,090,000 is in the costed risk provision; and agree that as risk decreases and the risk provision is released, the money will be diverted towards the further delivery of the enhancements of the scheme;
 3. The following additional funding is approved to be used to reach the next gateway:
 - o £394,473 of S106 funding (outlined in appendix 3 – table 3)
 - o The remaining existing approved Capital funding of £3,415,724 is released (outlined in appendix 3 table 3); and
 - o The sum of up to £700,000 of Capital funding is also approved to be used (subject to the outcome of the Capital Bid approvals); and
 - o That all remaining funding from pre-evaluation and up to gateway 5 will be carried forward to reach the next gateway as set out in table 2 of Appendix 3;
 4. The risk register in appendix 2 with the requested costed risk provision of £1,090,000, which is to be drawn down via delegation to Executive Director Environment;
 5. That Option 1, described in section 4 is taken forward (subject to the outcome of the statutory consultation of the Traffic Management Orders) to construction; and
 6. If the funding Bid for 2022/23 is not successful that the Project budget and costed risk provision be amended accordingly to (£5,977,930 and £390,000 respectively) and that the descoped scheme option – Option 2, be taken forward to construction (subject to the outcome of the Statutory Consultation of the Traffic orders).
7. **GATEWAY 3 ISSUE - WEST SMITHFIELD AREA PUBLIC REALM AND TRANSPORTATION PROJECT**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3 Issues report of the Executive Director of Environment regarding the West Smithfield Area Public Realm and Transportation project. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points.

The Sub Committee noted that the recommendations had been approved by the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee, but with the proposals having been heavily scrutinised and further work requested to take account of the impact of the Museum of London Relocation on the project proposals. The Chamberlain advised that sufficient funds were in place within the On Street Parking Reserve to fund the project. The Sub Committee, considering the proposals from a project management perspective, then approved the report.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee:

1. Approve the updated programme as per Project Programme in Appendix 5;
2. That budget of £15,000 for staff cost is approved to cover additional tasks associated with the revised programme and the completion of Stage 3.1;
3. That budget of £60,000 is approved to cover costs to salvage existing paving materials;
4. That £75,000 is allocated from OSPR from the £12m funding approved in principle for the project, subject to relevant approvals;
5. Note the revised project budget of 1,355,014 (excluding risk), from the £12m estimated budget which is unchanged; and
6. That Option 2 is approved, including completion of Stage 3.1, a revised programme and the release of funding to salvage historic materials.

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

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 5 Issues report on the Beech Street Transportation and Public Realm project. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report, also outlining the next steps and recommendations.

A Member commented that the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee had been clear that the two options presented for progressing the project should not be considered distinct options as if they were opposed to each other, and that both options should be part of the project going forward. The Member outlined the way forward agreed by the Streets & Walkways Sub Committee, with a consultation to be undertaken regardless. The Executive Director of Environment confirmed that a consultation-led approach had been discussed, and that a commitment would not be made until this had been satisfied.

In response to a question from the Deputy Chairman, the Chamberlain confirmed that the officers were content with the funding strategy for the project. The Deputy Chairman then drew the Sub Committee's attention to the recommendations for the Sub Committee, noting the approach to the project that would be taken forward.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee:

1. Approve the drawing down of costed risk (£189k) for the risks that have turned into issues;
2. Approve an increase in the project budget of £50k available from the 2021/22 capital bid to fund the investigation of occasional culture events on Beech Street;

3. Note the experiment findings (as set out from paragraph 33) and conclusions;
4. Note the intent to comprehensively engage with the public, user groups and stakeholders on the next phase of the project (Appendix 9); and
5. Note that the Barbican Healthy Streets Plan has been initiated which (in the medium term) will work towards delivering an area-based plan to delivering Healthy Streets, managing traffic and improving air quality in the Barbican and Golden Lane area.

9. **GATEWAY 2 - STONECUTTER COURT SECTION 278**

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2 report of the Executive Director of Environment on highway and public realm changes at Stonecutter Court. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points. In response to a question from the Deputy Chairman, the Executive Director of Environment confirmed that the survey fees were within the expected range.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee agree:

1. That budget of £65,000 is approved to reach the next Gateway;
2. Authorise officers enter in a section 278 agreement with the Developer; and
3. Note the total estimated cost of the project is £400,000 - £550,000 (excluding risk).

10. **CLS PILOT EXTENSION: PROCUREMENT & PROJECTS**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the TOM Programme Director proposing that the pilot proposals concerning streamlined processes relating to procurement and the projects gateway be extended to all relevant departments and institutions. The TOM Programme Director introduced the report, advising that the report had been withdrawn from other Committees for the time being in order to be submitted to the Sub Committee first, The TOM Programme Director also clarified a slight change to the recommendations for the Finance Committee which would take in new procurement thresholds.

Members commented that the pilot had been successful and welcomed changes to the corporate Scheme of Delegations as part of a move towards more strategic decision-making.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee agree that the following pilot proposals be extended to all departments and institutions within the City of London Corporation family: -

- The delegation in relation to development, refurbishment and revenue programme schemes be increased from a total project cost (including

works, fees and staff costs) of £250,000 to £1,000,000 in line with the recommended changes to the Gateway process; and

- Chief Officers, in consultation with the City Surveyor, approve schemes for maintenance or refurbishment of up to £1,000,000 per scheme.

11. GATEWAY 6 - CITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTRE

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 6 report of the City Surveyor regarding the City Mental Health Centre. The City Surveyor introduced the report and drew Members' attention to the key points. In response to a question from a Member, the City Surveyor advised that more asbestos had been found at the property than expected, which had required more resource to resolve. A Member commented that this had happened on a number of projects and suggested that the matter be reviewed as a potential Project Management Academy topic. The Deputy Chairman endorsed this and added that it was relevant to the undertaking of correct and sufficient surveys.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee agree approval of closure of project and lessons learned.

12. GATEWAY 6 - REDEVELOPMENT OF HAMPSTEAD HEATH ADVENTURE PLAYGROUND

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 6 report of the Executive Director of Environment regarding the redevelopment of Hampstead Heath Adventure Playground. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report, outlining the challenges faced during the project, which was completed behind schedule and slightly over budget. However, the Sub Committee was advised that the redeveloped adventure playground had been well-received by stakeholders.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee:

1. Note the contents of this report;
2. Note the lessons learnt; and
3. Authorise closure of this project.

13. GATEWAY 6 - BARTHOLOMEW CLOSE AND LITTLE BRITAIN ENHANCEMENT SCHEME

The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 6 report of the Executive Director of Environment on the Bartholomew Close and Little Britain Enhancement Scheme. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report and drew Members' Attention to the key points. The Sub Committee noted that the project had been completed under budget, and the Deputy Chairman commented that the project benefitted from dealing with stakeholders at the right time and that this would be a useful learning point to take forward.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee:

- Approve to close this project once the outstanding actions referred to in section 13 are complete;
- Approve the budget adjustment outlined in Appendix 4, table 4 existing funding commitments with JB Riney to be receipted; and
- Authorise the return of any underspend funds to the developer or their successor in title following closedown of the accounts related to the Section 278 and Section 106 contributions.

14. **ENVIRONMENT PROJECTS - CONSOLIDATED PROGRESS REPORT**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Environment setting out project updates and proposed associated programme changes for five projects from the Environment portfolio; St Paul's Churchyard, London Wall Place S278, Mark Lane Public Realm and Transportation Enhancements, Culture Mile – Look and Feel Experiments Phases 1-4 and 22 Bishopsgate S278. The Executive Director of Environment introduced the report, explaining the delay to the programme and advising that all five projects were currently under budget and considered low risk. The Sub Committee noted that a decision was required in respect of the programme changes.

In response to a question from a Member regarding St Paul's Churchyard, the Executive Director of Environment confirmed that officers were confident of completing the work under budget, adding that delay to the project was time-related due to a staff resource issue.

The Sub Committee welcomed reporting in this format, noting that issues of this nature could also be agreed under delegation in some circumstances, with this aspect of the Project procedure currently under review to identify any possible improvements.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee note the project updates and agree the associated programme changes.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

The Deputy Chairman then thanked any Members of the public watching via YouTube for their participation and wished all a happy Christmas, with the next meeting of the Sub Committee in January 2022.

17. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

Item No.	Paragraph No
18-25	3
26	3, 7
27-28	7
29-33	3
34-35	-
36	1, 2, 3
37	3, 7

18. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES RESOLVED** – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.
19. **NON-PUBLIC ACTIONS**
The Sub Committee noted that there were currently no non-public outstanding actions.
20. **PROPERTY PROJECTS GROUP (PPG) CONSTRUCTION MARKET UPDATE**
The Sub Committee received an oral update from the Property Projects Group (PPG) Director.
21. **NON-PUBLIC APPENDIX - GATEWAY 3 ISSUE - WEST SMITHFIELD**
The Sub Committee received a non-public appendix to the report at Item 7.
22. **GATEWAY 2 - GUILDHALL COMPLEX - REFURBISHMENT OPTIONS FOR THE NORTH AND WEST WINGS**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2 report of the City Surveyor.
23. **GATEWAY 5 ISSUE - 29A BROOK STREET**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 5 Issues report of the City Surveyor.
24. **GATEWAY 2 - GREAT GREGORIES YARD - FUTURE PROOFING BUILDINGS**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2 report of the Executive Director of Environment.
25. **GATEWAY 3 ISSUE - PHASE 2, 3 & 4 - CITY OF LONDON SCHOOL MASTERPLAN**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3 issues report of the City Surveyor.
26. **GATEWAY 3-4 - SECURE CITY PROGRAMME (SCP) - CCTV & TELECOMMUNICATIONS WORKSTREAM**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3-4 report of the Executive Director of Environment and the Commissioner of the City of London Police.

27. **GATEWAY 2 ISSUE - EASTERN CITY CLUSTER SECURITY SCHEME**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 2 Issues report of the Executive Director of Environment.
28. **GATEWAY 3-5 - BANK STATION UPGRADE - CANNON STREET ENTRANCE S278**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 3-5 report of the Executive Director of Environment.
29. **GATEWAY 1-5 - ESSENTIAL CITY OF LONDON POLICE ESTATE SECURITY UPGRADES**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the Gateway 1-5 report of the City of London Police.
30. **GATEWAY 1-5 - AUDIO VISUAL REFRESH FOR CITY OF LONDON POLICE**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 1-5 report of the Chamberlain.
31. **GATEWAY 6 - AVONDALE SQUARE RE-DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY CENTRE PROJECT**
The Sub Committee considered a Gateway 6 report of the City Surveyor.
32. **PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW**
The Sub Committee received a report of the Town Clerk.
- a) **Red Report: Barbican Fire Safety and Barbican/GSMD Confined Spaces**
The Sub Committee received a red report of the City Surveyor.
- b) **Red Report: Climate Action Strategy - Carbon Removals Project**
The Sub Committee received a red report of the Director of Open Spaces.
33. **REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**
The Sub Committee received a report of the Town Clerk.
34. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
35. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no items of urgent business.
36. **GATEWAY 1-4 - COVERT SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT - REPLACING END OF LIFE EQUIPMENT**
The Sub Committee considered a confidential report of the Commissioner of the City of London Police.
37. **CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER TOM PROPOSALS**
The Sub Committee considered a confidential report of the Chief Operating Officer.

The meeting closed at 12.59 pm

Chairman

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

PROJECTS SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 25 January 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Projects Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Keith Bottomley (Chairman)	Christopher Hayward
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)	Susan Pearson
Rehana Ameer	John Petrie
Randall Anderson	James de Sausmarez
Caroline Haines	

Officers:

Joseph Anstee	- Town Clerk's Department
Rohit Paul	- Town Clerk's Department
Sarah Baker	- Town Clerk's Department
Jonathan Cooper	- City Surveyor's Department
Ola Obadara	- City Surveyor's Department
Dorian Price	- City Surveyor's Department
Oscar Smith	- City Surveyor's Department
Sonia Virdee	- Chamberlain's Department

The Chairman welcomed all those in attendance and members of the public observing via YouTube to the meeting.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Catherine McGuinness, Andrew McMurtrie and Deputy Philip Woodhouse.

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

There were no declarations of interests.

3. GATEWAY APPROVAL PROCESS

RESOLVED – That the Gateway Approval Process be received.

4. MINUTES

The Sub Committee noted that the Chairman's apologies had been omitted in error and would be added to the list of apologies for absence by way of correction.

RESOLVED – That, pending the above correction, the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 15 December 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.

5. **PUBLIC ACTIONS**

There were no public outstanding actions.

6. **DELEGATED AUTHORITY REQUEST - CITY FUND - REFURBISHMENT/EXTENSION OF 6 BROAD STREET PLACE AND 15-17 ELDON STREET**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor seeking delegated authority for an Issues Report for the Refurbishment/Extension of 6 Broad Street Place and 15-17 Eldon Street. The City Surveyor introduced the report and outlined the reasons for the requested delegation.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee grant Delegated Authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to consider the merging of refurbishment projects at 6 Broad Street Place and 15-17 Eldon Street.

7. **DELEGATED AUTHORITY REQUEST - BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES - CANDLEWICK HOUSE, 116-126 CANNON STREET, LONDON, EC4**

The Sub Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor seeking delegated authority for an Issues Report for the Refurbishment/Extension of Candlewick House, 116-126 Cannon Street, London, EC4. The City Surveyor introduced the report and outlined the reasons for the requested delegation.

RESOLVED – That the Projects Sub Committee grant Delegated Authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to consider the Issues report for Candlewick House, 116-126 Cannon Street, London, EC4.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no items of urgent business.

The Chairman then thanked any Members of the public watching via YouTube for their participation.

10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

Item No.
11-18

Paragraph No
3

11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED – That the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.
12. **NON-PUBLIC ACTIONS**
The Sub Committee noted that there were currently no non-public outstanding actions.
13. **PROPERTY PROJECTS GROUP (PPG) CONSTRUCTION MARKET UPDATE**
The Sub Committee received an oral update from the Property Projects Group (PPG) Director.
14. **GATEWAY 2 - BARBICAN FIRE SAFETY AND BARBICAN/GSMD CONFINED SPACES**
The Sub Committee considered a joint report of the Managing Director of the Barbican Centre, Principal of GSMD and the City Surveyor.
15. **GATEWAY 5 - WALBROOK WHARF DEPOT - REPLACEMENT OF MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SERVICES**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor.
16. **GATEWAY 2 - CITY FUND - REFURBISHMENT OR REPLACEMENT OF THE FORESHORE RIVER DEFENCES FRONTING RIVERBANK HOUSE, UPPER THAMES STREET, LONDON EC4**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor.
17. **GATEWAY 6 - 123-124 NEW BOND STREET - REDEVELOPMENT BEHIND A RETAINED FACADE**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor.
18. **PORTFOLIO OVERVIEW**
The Sub Committee received a report of the Town Clerk.
 - a) **Red Report: Central Criminal Courts, Fire Alarm Replacements and associated public address system**
The Sub Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor.
19. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
20. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no items of urgent business.

21. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

RESOLVED – That the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.

The meeting closed at 12.16 pm

Chairman

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

RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Friday, 14 January 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at Informal Hybrid Meeting on Friday, 14 January 2022 at 12.30 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)	Deputy Edward Lord
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)	Jeremy Mayhew
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Sir Michael Snyder
Tijs Broeke	Deputy James Thomson
Christopher Hayward	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Shravan Joshi	

In Attendance

Officers:

John Barradell	- Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Gregory Moore	- Assistant Town Clerk
Peter Lisley	- Assistant Town Clerk
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications
John Cater	- Town Clerk's Department
Polly Dunn	- Town Clerk's Department
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Chamberlain
Dianne Merrifield	- Chamberlain's Department
Sonia Virdee	- Chamberlain's Department
Paul Wright	- Remembrancer's Department
Aaron Downey	- Private Secretary to the Chair of Policy & Resources

Members:

Randall Anderson
Deputy Wendy Hyde
Sophie Fernandes

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Deputy Keith Bottomley.

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

There were no declarations.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED, that the public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 17 December 2021, be approved as an accurate record.

4. **CAPITAL FUNDING - PRIORITISATION OF 2022/23 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS - STAGE 2 FINAL PROPOSALS**

Members considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding Capital Funding prioritisation of 2022/23 Annual Capital Bids (Stage 2 Final Proposals).

RESOLVED, that Members:

- Note the revised total value of 2022/23 bids of £45.6m (subject to final confirmation).
- Agree that the revised bids relating to three schemes detailed in paragraph 6 be rated as green, subject to final approval of the amount for the St Paul's Gyrotory revised bid.
- Confirm the proposed final RAG rating of £26.2m green, £12.6m amber and £6.8m red (detailed in the appendices).
- Agree that funding for the green bids of £26.1m be agreed in principle and incorporated into the medium-term financial plans of City Fund and City's Cash (noting that the balance of £0.1m has already been agreed by the BHE Board).
- Note that amber and red bids will be deferred with amber-rated bids to be placed on a reserve list to be progressed if savings are later identified from the provisions for green bids.
- Agree that the financial disciplines currently in place be continued, whereby
 - a) central funding will be withdrawn for schemes that slip by more than one year; and
 - b) the 'one-in, one-out' approach to funding of bids outside of the annual process be operated.
- Agree to the carry-over of the unallocated provision of £27.7m of loan facilities previously agreed for the Police and HRA.

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

There were no questions.

6. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was no other business.

7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

RESOLVED, that 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.

8. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

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

9. **PROPOSAL FOR ADDITIONAL RESTRICTION GRANT SCHEME INCORPORATING AN OPTION TO EXTEND THE CITY RECOVERY GRANT**

Members considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding a proposal for the Additional Restriction Grant Scheme incorporating an option to extend the City Recovery Grant.

10. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

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

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at 12.58 pm

Chairman

**Contact Officer: Polly Dunn
polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

Competitiveness Advisory Board

A public summary of the Competitiveness Advisory Board meeting held on 13 January 2022.

The Board held its second meeting with its full composition in January 2022. This meeting focused on seeking the views of the Board on how best to develop opportunities for UK to be a global destination for green and impact finance. In addition, the Board considered the factors in attracting further capital to the UK Green Tech and FinTech.

The Board received a report from the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth regarding the Corporation's approach to policy and promotion of UK sustainable finance offer. The following subjects were discussed in relation to the opportunities for green and impact finance:

- Building on the demonstration of UK leadership in sustainable finance demonstrated within international platforms and on how to finance a *Just Transition*
- Establishing the UK FPS sector as the go to partner on climate finance
- The importance of financing biodiversity and the provision of quality carbon removal products
- Build on social impact finance as an extension of climate finance
- The need to increase attention to financing green technology

The Board also discussed an update from the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth on opportunities in attracting more growth capital to UK Green Tech and FinTech. The Board considered the challenges in securing scale-up growth capital for technology businesses in the UK and noted the need to address the following points:

- The regulatory environment allowing for institutional investors to allocate more capital to tech businesses
- The importance that the economic ecosystem provides in terms of access to UK talent
- The opportunities for the City of London Corporation to celebrate tech entrepreneurs

The Board will meet next in May.

For any enquiries relating to the Competitiveness Advisory Board, please contact Richard.Holt@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

PUBLIC RELATIONS SUB (POLICY & RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Monday, 24 January 2022

Minutes of the informal meeting of the Public Relations Sub (Policy & Resources) Committee held at the Guildhall EC2 at 11.30 am

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)	Alderman Sir David Wootton
Christopher Hayward (Deputy Chairman)	Alderman Prem Goyal
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Edward Lord
Tijs Broeke	Andrew Mayer
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark	

Officers:

John Barradell	- Town Clerk & Chief Executive
Bob Roberts	- Director of Communications, Town Clerk's Department
Paul Double	- City Remembrancer
Paul Wright	- City Remembrancer's Department
Sanjay Odedra	- Town Clerk's Department
Eugenie de Naurois	- Town Clerk's Department
Sarah Bridgman	- Town Clerk's Department
Dominic Barker	- Town Clerk's Department
Sam Hutchings	- Town Clerk's Department
Joanna Burnaby-Atkins	- Town Clerk's Department
Aaron Downey	- Town Clerk's Department
Richard Messingham	- Town Clerk's Department
Polly Dunn	- Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Anne Fairweather and Alderman & Sheriff Nicholas Lyons. The Deputy Chairman, Christopher Hayward, issued apologies for lateness.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the public minutes and summary of the meeting held on 18 October 2021 be approved as a correct record.

4. **MEDIA UPDATE**

Members received a report of the Director of Communications regarding the Media Update. A short verbal update was issued by the Director.

The print advertising value had decreased this quarter, however, the City was still on target to meet the annual value of £10mil.

There were no current broadcasting targets, but work was in progress to develop a KPI or target in this area.

The Director of Communications agreed to use more codified descriptors in relation to negative press.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

5. **CORPORATE AFFAIRS UPDATE**

Members received a report of the Director of Communications regarding the Corporate Affairs Update.

Members noted that due to Omicron a few events scheduled for the end of 2021 had been rescheduled for early 2022.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

6. **UPDATE ON FILMING ACTIVITY IN THE CITY OF LONDON**

Members received a report of the Director of Communications regarding an Update on Filming Activity in the City of London.

Funds generated from filming were distributed to the asset owners.

There were plans with Innovation & Growth (IG) and Culture Teams to develop more offerings like 'movie walks', to attract visitors to the City. It was hoped that the planned online location library would encourage this and also support marketing in future.

Early conversations were underway with IG on how this can link in with work on Destination City, reinforcing the link between cultural attractions and businesses.

As film production companies were notoriously shy about release dates, it would be difficult to advise Members when they were. However, the Director of Communications suggested that in future iterations of the report, a summary of recently released productions could be provided.

Once a production was in the public domain (i.e. had been released) there was no issue whatsoever referring to sites featured within them.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

7. **PARLIAMENTARY TEAM UPDATE**

Members received a report of the City Remembrancer regarding the Parliamentary Team Update.

The Remembrancer provided a verbal update on each item within the report and advised on the likely timeline for the Public Service Pensions and Judicial Offices Bill timeline.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

There were no questions.

9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR CONSIDERS URGENT**

There was one item of urgent business concerning the Review of Sport Provision.

a) Review of Sport Provision

Members noted a report of the Director of Communications regarding the Review of Sport Provision.

Given recent interest and specific proposals from Members on the Court of Common Council, it was agreed that this review would take a holistic approach to sports and leisure. The Sub-Committee were supportive of the direction of travel.

It was requested that the distinctions between leisure, sport and physical fitness not be blurred.

RESOLVED – That Members endorse the work being undertaken by the Sport Engagement Officer, as outlined within the report, to review the City Corporation's sport offer.

10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

There was no further business, and the meeting was drawn to a close.

The meeting closed at 11.59 am

Chairman

Contact Officer: Polly Dunn
polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Culture, Heritage & Libraries – For decision Policy & Resources – For decision	Dated: 31/01/2022 17/02/2022
Subject: Beckford & Cass Statues Interpretation Project	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	3, 4, 10
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: Damian Nussbaum, Director Innovation & Growth	For Decision
Report authors: Elizabeth Scott, Head of Guildhall Art Gallery & London’s Roman Amphitheatre	

Summary

In October 2021, your Court of Common Council endorsed the recommendation of your Statues Working Group to retain the William Beckford and John Cass statues in Guildhall, instructing officers to work collaboratively with the City Arts Initiative and in consultation with relevant stakeholders to develop appropriate explanatory plaques to be placed alongside them.

In November 2021, Guildhall Art Gallery officers proposed an approach to your City Arts Initiative which, in turn, recommended the approach to your December Committee.

At that meeting, your Committee raised concerns relating to greater inclusion in the development of the plaques (specifically requesting that consultation panels not be limited to youth audiences) and over the use of QR codes. These, it felt, were likely to be superseded in a short space of time by technological advances. As a result, officers were instructed to return a proposal to your Committee in consideration of these concerns.

This report sets out options in relation to the above, following research and discussions with cultural heritage organisations who have worked with young people and intergenerational panels. It recommends that a co-creation/collaborative approach is taken, both for the factual interpretation and artistic responses to the statues; that an historian be commissioned to work with groups comprising schools/young people and older people to facilitate delivery; and that officers work with the City Surveyor and Historic England to agree a high-quality plaque that may easily be updated and replaced in a cost-effective way as and when QR technology becomes outdated.

Recommendation(s)

Members of the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee are asked to:

- Endorse the proposal for a co-creation/collaborative approach across age groups to develop the statues' interpretation to the Policy & Resources Committee.

Members of the Policy & Resources Committee are asked to:

- Approve the co-creation/collaborative approach across age groups as outlined above and under the proposals section of this report.

Main Report

Background

1. In October 2021, your Court of Common Council endorsed the recommendation of your Statues Working Group to retain the William Beckford and John Cass statues in Guildhall, instructing officers to work collaboratively with the City Arts Initiative, in consultation with all relevant stakeholders, to develop appropriate explanatory plaques to be placed alongside them.
2. This report relates specifically to the actions endorsed by Court to arrange wording for the plaques and deliver further content through the use of QR coding so that further information is available for those who may wish to seek it. All other actions within the Court report, including arrangements for educational activities and the physical production of the plaques are being, or will be, considered separately by relevant officers and Committees.
3. In November 2021, Guildhall Art Gallery officers proposed an approach to this work to your City Arts Initiative which, in turn, recommended the approach to your December 2021 Committee. Specifically, this proposed that:
 - a. Your (Guildhall Art Gallery) Education Officer and a consultant work with a youth panel to examine and interpret the two statues.
 - b. The youth panel work with the Gallery's curatorial team to commission contemporary artists to create artistic responses to the statues (to include a poet but which may also include other art forms).
 - c. The plaques, located on the monument or on the wall near them, combine factual information, stating why the statue is present in Guildhall and discussing the subject's involvement in the Transatlantic Slave Trade alongside a poetic response (as per item 3b above).
 - d. A QR code be featured on the plaque which links to further artistic responses that are hosted on the City Corporation's website (on the Gallery's and/or Great Hall's webpages) and which offers links to websites with further information about Beckford and Cass.

4. At that meeting, your Committee raised concerns requesting that statue consultation panels not be limited to youth audiences and over the use of QR codes which, it felt, are likely to be superseded in a short space of time by technological advances. As a result, officers were instructed to return a revised proposal to your Committee so that this may be endorsed for onward approval by your Policy & Resources Committee.

Current Position

5. Since your December meeting, Gallery officers have undertaken research and had discussions with colleagues in heritage organisations in order to gain insight and collect case studies from those who have experience of working with youth panels and/or intergenerational groups.
6. The majority of feedback from this research shows that intergenerational groups work well for long-term initiatives (for example, [Big Pit National Coal Museum's Intergenerational Group](#)). While differences in language and cultural assumptions between people of different generations can sometimes be barriers, sensitive facilitation, including allowing plenty of time for one-to-one conversations, can help create successful projects and challenge assumptions from both younger and older people.
7. Notably, there are opportunities and challenges of working with both groups, which are outlined in the options below.

Options

OPTION 1: Youth Panel / Intergenerational Panel

8. Working with youth panels reflects how many museums work with young people today and is considered best practice. It is something the Gallery has wanted to do for some time with this particular project providing the perfect opportunity to establish such a group. For example, [Leeds City Museum](#) has run a youth group for a decade. It is featured in the Kids in Museums' [Museum Youth Group Directory](#) which provides a comprehensive list of museum youth groups across the UK.
9. The age range of youth groups varies from 10 to 24 years, however most enlist young people aged 16-24. Working with a youth panel on this project would help recognise the valuable contribution that young people make to culture and heritage, ensuring their voices are heard and that they are able to take an active role in shaping the interpretation of the statues for which they are both current and future audiences.
10. A good example of such practice is the youth-led approach taken on the [Reframing Picton](#) project involving Amgueddfa Cymru – National Museum Wales – and community partner the Sub Saharan Advisory Panel. The museum's portrait of Thomas Picton (a Welsh military leader who became notorious for the cruelty of his reign as governor of Trinidad) has been removed and will be redisplayed and re-interpreted as part of the project.

11. While consulting directly with young people has been shown to have a very positive impact, connecting older adults with younger people can provide additional advantages. Intergenerational working can help build confidence, challenge assumptions and prejudices and help tackle social isolation and loneliness across groups.
12. However, intergenerational activities do not appeal to everyone and can cause anxiety for some. Older people may be daunted by the idea of interacting with younger people, particularly if they have not done so for many years. Meanwhile, young people can disengage in intergenerational projects as they may feel their voices are not heard.
13. Notably, participants will have different levels of confidence in participating in intergenerational activities. For this reason, the option of developing an intergenerational group is not recommended.

OPTION 2: Collaboration and co-creation with an artist

14. A second option – the recommended route – is the commissioning of an artist to work with different groups at different times to facilitate dialogue and to co-create an artwork. There are many successful examples of this approach, which was also recommended by Historic England during the research undertaken for this report.
15. There are a number of artists who have extensive experience and are extremely adept at being the facilitator between different age groups and diverse stakeholders. These artists usually work with the age groups separately and then bring their ideas together to create an artwork.
16. Examples include [*Where Light Falls*](#), an Historic-England-led project to commission two new poems to tell the story of those who risked their lives to protect St Paul's and Coventry Cathedral during the Second World War. Keith Jarrett (the poet commissioned to write London's poem for this project) worked with four schools, Exiled Writers Ink – a group of writers who have in common a background of immigrant, exile, refugee or migrant status – and the Creative Writes group – older writers who gather regularly in Islington. Jarrett's final poem mixed and incorporated the words from each group session: *'My idea was to bring them together, if not physically in the same room, then at least in their words.'*
17. Another example of this approach is [*The Reconciliation Reredos*](#) - a project to develop a major public artwork by St Stephen's Church, Bristol, in response to the church's complex historical legacy with slavery. Throughout the process, multi-media artist Graeme Mortimer Evelyn was in dialogue with a wide range of people delivering a community learning programme that engaged differing groups of Bristolians through workshops, forums and events. Community engagement was an essential part of the project, with the objective to reconnect the church to its community. The resulting artwork responds to the church's past, reflects the voices of the city today, while representing the potential of the future.

Proposals

18. OPTION 2 - a co-creation/collaborative approach - is the recommended route, both for the factual interpretation and artistic responses to the Guildhall's statues.
19. If this option is approved by your Committee, the Gallery would commission an historian to work with groups comprising schoolchildren and young people and, separately, older people, on the interpretation (the explanation of the statues) which will also function as a foundation for the artistic responses. This would constitute stage 1 of the project.
20. For stage 2, the Gallery would commission artists to work with the different groups to facilitate discussions and co-create an artistic response to the statues.
21. This approach has proven to be successful for other projects and allows everyone to participate equally with their peers.
22. Regarding the use of QR codes and to future-proof the plaques, your officers will work with the City Surveyor and Historic England to agree a high-quality plaque design that is fabricated to be easily updated and replaced in a cost-effective way as and when required (this may – for example – see a more permanent pedestal, with a replaceable plaque face).
23. As per the original proposal, the QR code would link those seeking to find out more, to the artistic responses described in item 17, and to further information about Beckford and Cass and their involvement in the Transatlantic Slave Trade.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

- **Strategic implications** include alignment with the Corporate Plan at outcomes 3, 4, and 10 in that the proposals:
 - Provide access to world-class heritage, culture and learning to people of all ages, abilities and backgrounds.
 - Bring individuals and communities together to share experiences and promote wellbeing, mutual respect and tolerance.
 - Protect, curate and promote world-class heritage assets, cultural experiences and events.

The proposals also align with the cross-cutting theme of inclusion in the City Corporation's Recovery Strategy [Square Mile: Future City](#), noting that collaboration should be at the heart of what museums do, and that the statues' histories should be debated through a genuinely inclusive and ethical approach if the City Corporation is to successfully engage the next generation and the communities it serves.

- **Financial implications:** the cost of the proposals in this report is estimated at £17,000 which will be met by the Cultural and Visitor Services local risk budget in the budget year 2021/22. Should the work take longer, a request for a carryover to the 2022/23 year may be submitted. Some funding towards fabrication and installation of the plaques is included in this figure but the full cost of this may only be accurately estimated once the content of the plaques (including the artistic

responses) has been determined. This may, therefore, require a modest bid for funding during the next financial year.

- **Resource implications:** Gallery staff may be stretched during the period of the project while they work on other major initiatives (between January and March 2022, the Gallery will be closed for essential maintenance, while installation of a new major temporary exhibition is planned). However, it is anticipated that a significant proportion of the work may be undertaken within the current financial year.
- **Legal implications:** an application for Listed Building Consent may need to be submitted via the City Surveyor's department to enable the installation of the plaques, subject to their format and fixtures.
- **Risk implications:** sufficient time must be given for the development and commissioning process which must be treated with appropriate sensitivity (e.g., other similar projects have taken 12 months and are still ongoing). Temporary sign stands will be placed in front of both statues and will give the statues context and explain the re-interpretation project until the permanent plaques are ready for installation.
- **Equalities implications:** the proposals consider the opportunity to engage with communities across the spectrum and to commission artists who will consider Black experiences and amplify the voices of those whose lives are most affected by Beckford and Cass's legacy today.
- **Climate implications:** none
- **Security implications:** none

Conclusion

24. The proposals within this report offer a way forward for the re-interpretation of the Beckford and Cass statues using an inclusive approach that centres the voices of the communities who are most affected by Beckford and Cass's legacy today. The proposals also reflect best museum practice.

Appendices

- Minute extract of the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee meeting on 31st January 2022 indicating the decision taken.

Elizabeth Scott

Head of Guildhall Art Gallery & London's Roman Amphitheatre

T: 020 7332 1832

E: elizabeth.scott@cityoflondon.gov.uk

CULTURE, HERITAGE AND LIBRARIES COMMITTEE (DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT)

Monday, 31 January 2022

7. BECKFORD & CASS STATUES INTERPRETATION PROJECT

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth concerning the William Beckford and John Cass statues.

Members expressed concerns about the proposals in the report. A Member who had served on the Statues Working Party (SWP) said that their experience of SWP had been that the focus of the project should be on explaining the historical context of the statues rather than on an artistic response, which might be either a work of art or a poetry commission. Other Members of the Committee agreed with the view that the historical explanation should be at the centre of the project. A Member said that they hoped the Committee would have sight of the finished explanation. The Chair, who had also served on SWP, said that there had always been an intention to involve artwork in the project. In reply, Officers said that the historical context would be at the front and centre of the project and on the plaques. The artwork would support the explanation of the historical context and be accessible through QR codes included on the plaques. These codes would lead to a website which would provide further explanation of the historical context and the artistic responses. Significant but separate work on the educational side would be run by the Education Services in the Community and Children's Services Department and would be included in the paper to go to the Court of Common Council.

Members also expressed their concern that the report recommended that the advisory panels be split by age group. An Officer replied that the proposal to split the consultation panels by age was on the recommendation of the heritage industry. However, Members felt that an integrated intergenerational panel would be beneficial, as it would allow the different age groups the opportunity to listen to the other, rather than separate panels for different age ranges.

A Member commented that the proposals in the report did not make any reference to SEND stakeholders being included in the groups, and that they felt it was important to be inclusive among the range of SEND young people. An Officer replied that the groups will be representative and will include the SEND community as well as amplifying the voices of those whose lives are most affected by Beckford and Cass's legacy today.

A Member said that they would prefer for the Committee to see a revised version of the report with a focus on the explanation for retain and explain, and the groups for consultation, so that all Members could be clear on what they were endorsing before a paper went to the Policy and Resources Committee.

The Chair suggested that Members endorse the proposals but add that they strongly recommended an integrated intergenerational panel rather than separate panels for different age ranges.

RESOLVED, that – Members:

Endorse the proposal for a co-creation/collaborative approach across age groups to develop the statues' interpretation to the Policy & Resources Committee, and strongly recommend an integrated intergenerational panel rather than separate panels for different age ranges. In accordance with Standing Order 38, James Tumbridge's vote against the resolution was recorded.

Committee: Policy and Resources Committee for Decision	Dated: 17/02/2022
Subject: Opportunity London Campaign	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	7,8 & 10
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
What is the source of Funding?	Local Risk, City Fund
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Y
Report of: City Surveyor, Executive Director Environment	For Decision
Simon McGinn, CPAT Manager	

Summary

Opportunity London is a new three-year public / private partnership that has been established in the face of growing international competition and the challenges faced by Brexit and the global pandemic to focus on the promotion of London as a place to invest. It will be targeted at global investment decision-makers such as sovereign wealth funds (SWFs), institutional pension funds, asset managers, private equity and high-net worth individuals. The core public sector partners for the campaign comprise the City of London Corporation, the GLA, London & Partners and London Councils. New London Architecture (NLA) together with the London Communications Agency will deliver the programme and associated marketing and communications campaign and will seek to obtain private sector sponsorship to support activities over an initial three-year period.

The proposal is for the City Corporation to sponsor the Opportunity London campaign at a cost of £25,000 to be taken from the City Property Advisory Team local risk budget for an initial one-year period, to allow assessment of the programme for future involvement. A further report evaluating the outcomes of the partnership with recommendations for future involvement and funding will be submitted at the end of the first year

Recommendation(s)

- I. To agree £25,000 to be used from the CPAT local risk budget (2021/2022) to fund the Corporation's sponsorship for an initial one-year period to assess the success of the campaign before making any further financial commitment.

Main Report

Background

1. London's reputation as the world-leading city for business has been challenged by the impacts of Brexit and the recent global pandemic. In addition, London has also been affected by the "levelling up" agenda which has redistributed benefits to other parts of the UK despite London experiencing a considerably higher unemployment rate than the national average. This report is timely as it coincides with the forthcoming publication of the levelling up agenda white paper.
2. It is vital that London continues to attract inward investment. While London & Partners is the key promotional agency to focus on bringing inward investment into the capital, it has no remit to promote London to the global investment-decision makers who decide where and when to invest wealth.
3. In previous years, the City Corporation has participated at the international property trade show MIPIM in Cannes which previously attracted 28,000 investors and property professionals from across the globe.

Current Position

4. It is anticipated that MIPIM may take some time to re-establish itself which has led to the need to consider a broader programme of activity taking place across the year. Opportunity London seeks to address this gap, through development of a programme of direct engagement in key global regions whilst also ensuring that MIPIM is still an integral part of the programme. The City Corporation intends to participate again at MIPIM in March 2022, albeit on a much-reduced scale.
5. The Opportunity London campaign proposes to enlist a limited number of key spokespeople across the private and public sectors from a diverse and representative group to become "influencers" at national and international investment trade shows and events where they will have the opportunity to participate in speaking and networking opportunities. In addition to property related events, it is also anticipated that the campaign will look to support wider trade visits around both the London Mayor and Lord Mayor visits in to key international markets where either the Lord Mayor or Chair of Policy and Resources could support the promotion for investment into London, as key "influencers".
6. NLA has considerable experience in managing the delivery of private and public sector tradeshows through their delivery of the London Stand at the annual MIPIM property trade show. Through their involvement they have established significant links with the key UK private sector property representatives, the UK regions and Cities. They have an established track record in delivering comprehensive programmes to promote London's built environment through events, research and social media. They are seeking to partner with the London Communications Agency to deliver the programme to engage with global capital real estate investors

7. The tradeshows and events will be supported by wider marketing activity which includes but is not limited to the development of a website, promotional brochure, a key message handbook and an events calendar (Further details set out in Appendix 1). The campaign will seek to bring on board the private sector to fund many of the activities with a target budget of £750,000pa. The campaign has received support from the GLA, London and Partners, London Councils and London First and is about to commence reaching out to private sector partners. The funding will pay for the marketing and communication support and costs for the key “influencers” to attend the programme of events. The “influencers” who will attend events will be determined by the location and nature of the event.

Options

8. The City Corporation has been approached to become one of the key public sector partners to promote Opportunity London at a cost of £25,000 for an initial one-year period with a review of its effectiveness to determine whether there should be further ongoing support. The partnership will be seeking between 10-15 private sector sponsors to support the target budget of £750,000 and sponsorship by the City Corporation will demonstrate a clear commitment to support the campaign. Failure to provide financial support could put in jeopardy the delivery of the campaign at what is a critical time following Brexit and the global pandemic

Proposal

9. It is proposed that the City Corporation agree sponsorship of the Opportunity London campaign at a cost of £25,000 for one year to be paid from CPAT’s local risk budget. The programme will be assessed after the initial year and reported to your committee to determine whether or not to provide further financial support.

Corporate & Strategic Implications –

10. The Opportunity London campaign aligns with the City Corporation’s corporate priorities in terms of supporting *a thriving economy* and will be instrumental in helping to support our aspirations to create “*a global hub for innovation in financial and professional services, commerce and culture.*” Attracting inward investment can also help to give us access to the skills and talent that we need and will in turn help *inspire enterprise, excellence, creativity and collaboration.*
11. The Opportunity London campaign also aligns with the London Mayor’s 2021 election manifesto where he has pledged to “*champion the city across the globe as a location for investment and the best place to start and grow a business.*”

Financial implications:

12. £25,000 to be allocated from the current CPAT local risk budget from City Fund for an initial one-year period.

Resource implications:

13. The Chair and Deputy Chair of Policy and Resources Committee or senior representatives may be approached to take on the role of influencers / spokespeople at national and international events which would include meeting with investors, participating in speaking opportunities and attending hospitality /networking events.
14. The precise make-up of the representatives will be determined by the event in consultation with the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee and the Corporate Affairs office.
15. The CPAT team and Director of Communication will support members in these endeavours and will also oversee the City Corporation's representation in wider marketing efforts.

Legal implications:

16. The main purpose of the City's involvement would be to support key adopted strategies to promote the City as a leading world business centre and to encourage inward investment. As such, its power to undertake the activity in its City Fund capacity and to incur City Fund expenditure is in Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011.

Risk implications:

17. None

Equalities implications

18. None

Climate implications:

19. Many of the opportunities outside of UK will require international travel abroad to areas such as the Far East, Middle East, and North America as part of established delegations. Most of these trips will require travel by plane. There is no current way to operate flights without emitting CO2 – the zero emissions technologies are not available, and sustainable fuels, with a lower carbon footprint, are still scarce. Flights will be booked with airlines that seek to partly address the impact on the environment.

Security implications

20. None

Conclusion

21. In the face of the challenges posed by Brexit and the global pandemic, the Opportunity London campaign provides a crucial, multi-agency platform to promote London and the City's development opportunities to investors. Building on the success of MIPIM in previous years, the campaign will enable a consistent narrative with the key decision makers in the international global investment world and will provide the targeted resources needed to ensure that London remains at the forefront of investment decisions.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 Opportunity London marketing and communication activities

Simon McGinn
CPAT Team Leader
City Surveyor's department

T: [020 7332 3493]

E: Simon.mcgin@cityoflondon.gov.uk]

Appendix 1

Opportunity London marketing and communication activities

Website: a dedicated website will bring together the different components of the campaign. The site will include a core link to London & Partners but will also provide a useful link to the City Corporation website which will not only raise the profile of our own investment offer but drive more web traffic to our own web pages.

Promotional brochure: the brochure will provide up to date, tangible information to investors at trade shows and other promotional events. The promotional brochure will contain key messages about London's investment potential and as a principal sponsor, the City Corporation will have the opportunity to provide input into these messages.

Opportunity London 2022 directory: building on the 2021 launch edition, the Opportunity London directory promotes exemplar projects in regeneration, commercial developments, housing and green infrastructure across the London boroughs and will be featured on both the NLA and Opportunity London website when published. The directory will showcase the City's development pipeline and encourage greater investment into key opportunity areas.

Key facts handbook: the handbook will contain key facts targeted at the mobile investment market and will complement the print promotional brochure – enabling us to input our own key messages which will grab the attention of international investment decision makers.

Social media channels: social media will be incorporated into the campaign to help generate wider leverage of key messages at trade shows and other promotional activities.

Events calendar: an annual events calendar will enable the campaign to track both ad-hoc and regular events that will target investors. The emphasis will be predominantly on overseas events but will also include domestic events such as UKREiF in May 2022. Each event will be categorised in order of priority and a central spreadsheet will identify each event, prioritise it, allocate resources and responsibility as well as provide post-event feedback.

Agenda Item 6

Committee(s): Policy & Resources – For decision	Dated: February 17th 2022
Subject: Establishing a membership body to boost socio-economic diversity at senior levels in UK financial services	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	5, 8
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N – already approved
If so, how much?	£75K max
What is the source of Funding?	Section 106
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	Y
Report of: Damian Nussbaum, Executive Director of Innovation and Growth (IG)	For Decision
Report author: Sophie Hulm, Head of Skills Policy, Innovation and Growth (IG)	

Summary

The City Corporation is leading a taskforce to boost socio-economic diversity at senior levels in UK Financial and Professional Services. The taskforce was commissioned by HM Treasury and the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy in November 2020. The taskforce concludes in November 2022.

This report updates Members on the Taskforce’s work to date, including the launch of a membership body to continue the work of the taskforce. Members are asked to approve City Corporation support of the new body. Our support will demonstrate to industry that we are willing to work alongside employers to create a legacy for the taskforce. Any contribution will come from Section 106 planning contributions, agreed by your committee in October 2021 and ringfenced for skills. We are not seeking additional resources outside of these available funds.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- a) Approve the City Corporation’s support of a new membership body, which will continue the work of the taskforce.
- b) Approve the release of planning obligation funds, ringfenced for skills work, to provide this support. Delegate authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to agree the sum to be released (not to exceed £75k) and the exact nature of support for the body, and to implement the agreed support measures (subject to the measures being within the Terms of Reference of Policy and Resources Committee and within the agreed sum).

Main Report

Background

1. A new taskforce, led by the City Corporation, was announced by the Economic Secretary for the Treasury John Glen MP and the then Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Business and Industry Nadim Zahawi in November 2020. The taskforce aims to boost socio-economic diversity at senior levels in UK financial and professional services. Government have commissioned the City Corporation to lead this taskforce until November 2022.
2. The taskforce was informed by evidence. Research commissioned by the City Corporation (Appendix 3) showed that 89% of senior roles in financial services are held by people from higher socio-economic backgrounds (defined by parental occupation at 14). This compares to 52% of UK CEOs economy wide and to 37% of people across the UK working population. Those from lower socio-economic backgrounds progress 25% slower than peers, with no link to performance.
3. The Taskforce has industry-wide backing. Over 100 organisations across a range of sub sectors and regions are involved. Together they are shaping outputs and working towards greater socio-economic diversity at senior levels. Further details on membership can be found at www.cityoflondon.go.uk/WhoGetsAhead
4. The taskforce is chaired by your Chair of Policy, Catherine McGuinness. The Chair is supported by three Co-Chairs: the Lord Mayor of the City of London, Alderman Vincent Keaveny, former Co-Chair of the Social Mobility Commission and DLA Piper Partner Sandra Wallace, and the Permanent Secretary to the Levelling Up Taskforce and former Chief Economist at the Bank of England, Andy Haldane.
5. The vision for the taskforce is for equity of progression - where high performance is valued over 'fit' and 'polish'. The Government commissioning letter (Appendix 2) states three core outputs:

Workstream #1: Industry consultation and roadmap on how government, regulators and sector bodies can incentivise employer action.

Workstream #2: Membership body/peer network for financial services, focusing specifically on progression, a safe space to share best practice / benchmark against sector peers.

Workstream #3: A productivity analysis, to build the business case for socio-economic diversity at senior levels.

Current Position

6. Workstream 1 - Led by Sandra Wallace and delivered by Deloitte, the industry consultation seeks views from regulators, sector bodies, employers and Government. Roundtables seeking industry views are taking place in partnership with the Investment Association, TheCityUK, The Law Society, London Chamber of Commerce, and the ABI. Scheduled meetings with Government representatives include Ministers Lee Rowley, John Glen and Kemi Badenoch, and MPs Caroline

Nokes and Harriet Baldwin. The results of the consultation will be published late Summer 2022.

7. Workstream 2 – Led by the Lord Mayor and delivered by a social enterprise, Connectr, the membership body is due for launch in April / May 2022. Development of the membership body was a key recommendation of the Bridge Group research, referred to in paragraph 2. The body's structure and scope has been developed by senior level taskforce representatives. This includes those from Santander, Blackrock, FCA, Financial Services Skills Commission, AXA, Social Mobility Foundation, Fidelity, Barrington Hibbert, Mizuho and Chartered Insurance Institute. The purpose of the membership body is to boost socio-economic diversity at senior levels in UK financial services, and to continue the work of the taskforce.
8. Workstream 3 – Led by Andy Haldane and delivered by PwC, this workstream is data led and focuses on evidencing the business case for socio-economic diversity at senior levels. A sector-wide employee survey is live until March 2022. Support from industry is strong. Over 30 employers have distributed the survey to employees, complemented by secondary data on over 250K employees. A final report is due in Autumn 2022 and will touch on issues such as the cost of wasted talent.

Options – as below.

Proposals

9. Paragraph 7 refers to the development of a new body, led by the Lord Mayor as Chair of workstream 2. The City Corporation's participation, with other stakeholders, in developing this new body is aligned with the Lord Mayor's People and Purpose theme. The body will be employer led and funded by industry, and endorsed by government and regulators.
10. The body will deliver services to its members, including a forum to share best practice and guidance on collecting data on socio-economic background. In developing the services, the taskforce has benefited from the experience of similar bodies (including the Financial Services Skills Commission, as its Chair Mark Hoban sits on the taskforce). The new body will be a Community Interest Company, independent of any existing organisation.
11. Current proposals are to create the body with a five-to-ten-year lifespan - sufficient time to collect data and set improvement measures for members. Details of the exact contribution required from industry have not been finalised yet, however, membership fees are likely to be in the region of £10k per year, per company, with founding partners contributing seed funding of £50K-£75K of in-kind or financial support.
12. The priorities of the new body align with City Corporation priorities. Our support of the body will demonstrate to industry that we are willing to work alongside employers to create a legacy for the taskforce.

13. Support for the body could include:

- a) A position as founding partner – expected to be a one-off sum of £50k-£75k (either in-kind e.g. secondment of staff/venue use, or the financial equivalent).
- b) Provision of a Board Director (and Guarantor - nominal sum liability).

14. As the detail of the proposed body is still to be finalised, we are unable to specify the exact nature of City Corporation support. Therefore, Members are asked to delegate responsibility for final agreement to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair of Policy.

Key Data

Corporate & Strategic Implications

15. **Strategic implications** – Supporting access to skills and talent is a priority under the Thriving Economy theme of the Corporate Plan. It is a key part of work to ensure London and the UK remain a world leading financial centre. In addition, focusing on inclusion and growth through talent and skills development, also supports the specific outcome “Businesses are trusted and socially and environmentally responsible
16. **Financial implications** - Resourcing of the City Corporation’s support for the membership body can be met from Section 106 funding, already approved by your committee and ringfenced for skills work (see Appendix 1). To comply with planning policy, the support would either be in-kind (venue space, secondees) or financial support of a specific programme of work undertaken by the body.
17. **Resource Implications** – None
18. **Equalities Implications** – Positive
19. **Climate Implications** - Positive
20. **Risk Implications** – Reputational risk of not collaborating with industry.
21. **Legal Implications** – Board membership to be considered.

Conclusion

22. These proposals show how the City Corporation can play a central part in supporting access to talent in the financial services sector, and create a legacy for the taskforce, in partnership with industry.

Appendices

Appendix 1

- S106 Skills Funding

Appendix 2

- HMT BEIS Commissioning letter

Appendix 3

- Bridge Group report

Background Papers

Approval of use of Section 106 funding (2022/23-24/25)

<https://democracy.cityoflondon.gov.uk/documents/s159494/S106%20PRC%20Future%20Skills%20and%20Talent%20FINAL.pdf>

Sophie Hulm

Head of Skills Policy, Innovation and Growth

T: 07834384968

E: sophie.hulm@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1

S106 Skills Funding

Skills work is resourced via Planning obligations (often called section 106 agreements) funds that are ringfenced for skills work. On 14th October 2021, your committee approved the release of three years of section 106 funding to support Innovation and Growth work on skills, in support of the corporate plan. Members are asked to approve an allocation, from within these agreed funds, to enable City Corporation support for the body. The value of any support will be agreed in discussion with the Town Clerk and Chair of Policy.

As at 31 January 2022, the available Section 106 monies totalled £1,080,707. Any contribution for the membership body will come from these available funds, ringfenced for skills. We are not seeking additional resources outside of these available funds.

In line with City Corporation's Supplementary Planning Document, this funding enables the City Corporation to "*work with partners and neighbouring boroughs to promote employability, provide jobs and growth and deliver a diverse and inclusive workforce.*" Funding will allow the body to be established, leading to a programme of specific initiatives on inclusion and diversity, supporting disadvantaged City workers into roles, specifically those from lower socio-economic backgrounds. Reporting on the impact of the membership body will be through the City Corporation's Annual Monitoring Report.

Appendix 2

Commission for a taskforce to boost socio-economic diversity in UK financial and professional services

The Government is committed to maintaining a strong and globally competitive financial and professional services sector in the UK. Getting the right leadership is key to tackling the range of strategic challenges and opportunities facing these critical areas. The best way to get the right people at the top is to ensure that all talented people have the opportunity to succeed.

We are attaching to this letter a commission for a taskforce to boost socio-economic diversity at senior levels in financial and professional services across the UK.

The taskforce will have three workstreams:

1. Leading an industry consultation on how government, regulators and sector bodies can incentivise employer action on socio-economic diversity.
2. Creating a membership body/peer network for financial services, to increase employer engagement and accountability in delivering socio-economic diversity at senior levels (akin to similar bodies that already exist for law and accountancy).
3. Producing a productivity analysis, to build the business case for increasing socio-economic diversity at senior levels in financial and professional services.

We are grateful for the City of London Corporation's willingness to take on this work. We are sure you do not underestimate the importance of this work in supporting the Government's levelling up agenda.

As we have learned from HM Treasury's Women in Finance Charter, sustained commitment from industry leaders can create meaningful change. In addition to the wider societal imperative, there are real business benefits to creating a more diverse workforce.

Increasing diversity of thought and creating a culture where everyone can fulfil their potential can increase innovation and enable better decision making. This will ultimately lead to more productive and more competitive financial and professional services sectors. We hope that firms will seize the opportunity the taskforce provides to develop a more diverse pipeline and ensure they are truly recruiting and promoting on merit.

We expect the City Corporation to report back on the impact and findings of the taskforce by November 2022, with the first taskforce meeting due to take place in May 2021, and a series of bilateral engagements prior to this. During the life of the taskforce, we expect progress to be fed back to Government through quarterly Strategy Steering Group meetings. We look forward to working in partnership with you on these important issues.

Context

Organisations such as the Social Mobility Commission, Sutton Trust, and the Social Mobility Foundation have highlighted the unequal access to roles in financial and professional services. Reassuringly, the sector has already begun to act.

Employers have never been more focused in their efforts to reach out to local schools, build up a talent pipeline and create fairer recruitment practices.

Where there is a gap, however, is in retention and progression. Evidence from the Social Mobility Commission shows that both financial services and professional services have worryingly high class pay gaps.

Recent research by the Bridge Group undertaken across seven employers in the financial services sector shows that socio-economic diversity remains lacking even at junior levels; and is acutely lacking in more senior roles. Importantly, talented people from lower socio-economic backgrounds waste energy assimilating to dominant cultures. This has serious implications for individual and organisational productivity, as well as individual wellbeing. This builds on Bridge Group research recently undertaken in the legal sector, looking at pathways to partnership.

Without progression being addressed alongside recruitment, real change cannot take place. Addressing socio-economic diversity at senior levels will support the Government's objectives to boost productivity and level up opportunity across the UK.

HM Treasury and the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) invite the City of London Corporation to lead an independent taskforce to boost socio-economic diversity at senior levels in UK financial and professional services.

Objectives

The intention of this taskforce is to engage employers and encourage action through raising the profile of socio-economic diversity. Its vision is for equity of progression - where high performance is valued over 'fit'.

The taskforce aims to boost socio-economic diversity at senior levels in UK financial and professional services.

The taskforce will have three workstreams:

1. Leading an industry consultation on how government, regulators and sector bodies can incentivise employer action on socio-economic diversity.
2. Creating a membership body/peer network for financial services, to increase employer engagement and accountability in delivering socio-economic diversity at senior levels (akin to similar bodies that already exist for law and accountancy).
3. Producing a productivity analysis, to build the business case for increasing socio-economic diversity at senior levels in financial and professional services.

Governance

The taskforce will be chaired by Catherine McGuinness, Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee, City of London Corporation and three Co-Chairs: Alderman

Vincent Keaveny (Senior Alderman, City of London Corporation), Sandra Wallace (Interim Chair of Social Mobility Commission), and Andy Haldane (Chief Economist, Bank of England).

The Chair and Co-Chairs will constitute the quarterly Strategy Steering Board, which will provide strategic direction to the taskforce.

The three workstreams will be led by taskforce members who are senior level financial and professional services professionals, or experts in the field of socio-economic diversity. The taskforce will meet four times prior to the end date of November 2022. The taskforce members will be supported by three working groups of subject matter experts, who will meet monthly throughout the period. City of London is responsible for all chair, taskforce member and subject matter expert appointments on an independent basis and these will not be Government appointments. This structure will be supported by delivery partners PwC, Deloitte and MyKindaFuture (now Connectr).

The taskforce is being conducted on an independent basis. Government will be represented as an 'observer' at the quarterly Strategy Steering Board meetings. Regulators will be invited to attend meetings on the first workstream in an observer capacity only. They will however be able to participate fully in workstreams without a regulation focus.

Workstreams 1 & 3 will make recommendations for industry, regulators, sector bodies and policy makers. The recommendations will be presented to HM Treasury and BEIS for consideration. Workstream 2 will set up a membership body/peer network. This will launch and be functioning during the 2021/22 City of London mayoralty, to drive employer action on socio-economic diversity at senior levels.

Government officials will have monthly check-ins with the City of London Corporation and the delivery partners throughout the period, to determine impact and provide guidance as necessary.

Found at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/socio-economic-diversity-taskforce-in-financial-and-professional-services/hmt-beis-commissioning-lttr-for-socio-economic-diversity-taskforce#:~:text=Commission%20for%20a%20taskforce%20to,UK%20financial%20and%20professional%20services&text=Producing%20a%20productivity%20analysis%2C%20to,in%20financial%20and%20professional%20services>

Appendix 3

Bridge Group report can be found at <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/supporting-businesses/economic-research/research-publications/who-gets-ahead-and-how>

Agenda Item 7

Committee(s): Policy and Resources Committee – For decision	Dated: 17/02/2022
Subject: Support for Financial and Literacy Inclusion Campaign	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	Corporate Plan outcomes 3, 8 and 10
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Yes
If so, how much?	£75,000
What is the source of Funding?	Policy Initiatives Fund 2022/23
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	Agreed, subject to P&R approval
Report of: Bob Roberts, Executive Director of Communications and External Affairs	For Decision
Report author: Sarah Bridgman, Corporate Affairs Officer	

Summary

The City of London Corporation has been approached by the Financial Times’ charity Financial Literacy and Inclusion Campaign (FLIC) to support its project to deliver financial literacy education in schools.

The project will teach pupils in secondary schools how to manage their money more effectively.

It is intended the programme will be delivered in City of London Academy Trust schools.

The project will include a section on careers available in the City.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Agree support for the Financial Literacy and Inclusion Campaign project to deliver financial education in schools, with £75,000 from the 2022/23 Policy Initiatives Fund.
- Support the delivery of this project in City of London Academy Trust Schools, subject to the agreement of the Trust’s headteachers.
- Support the inclusion of a proposed module on jobs in the City as part of the education programme.

Main Report

Background

1. The Financial Times newspaper has established a charity, the Financial and Literacy Inclusion Campaign (FLIC). FLIC is chaired by the Deputy Editor of the Financial Times, Patrick Jenkins, and is supported by other City figures including Clare Woodman, EMEA CEO of Morgan Stanley and Andreas Utermann, former CEO of Allianz Global Investors.
2. The Campaign has identified a need for better financial education for young people in order to help improve their mastery of money and in turn, improve their social mobility and life prospects. Their research has shown that 90% of people learned nothing or not much about finance in school, and that 88% of teachers feel unqualified to deliver financial literacy. In order to try and meet that need, FLIC intends to deliver improved financial education through the creation of a bespoke package of resources and workshops, and through the training of teachers to deliver this programme.
3. The project is also supported by other external partners such as the charity National Numeracy.

Current Position

4. FLIC approached the City Corporation to ask for financial support and has suggested the project could be delivered in City of London Academy Trust (CoLAT) schools.
5. Officers have discussed the proposal with the Chief Executive of CoLAT and have given a presentation to the Trust's headteachers.
6. It has been positively received and the trust would consider including the new programme in the secondary curriculum from the Autumn term of 2022.

Proposals

7. The Policy & Resources Committee is asked to provide £75,000 from the Policy Initiatives Fund for 2022/23, categorised under 'Communities' and charged to 'City's Cash'. The £75,000 cost would cover the training of 200 teachers and allow the content to be delivered to between 6,000 and 12,000 children.
8. It is proposed the programme be delivered to secondary schools in the City of London Academy's Trust, subject to the approval of CoLAT headteachers.
9. It is proposed that as part of the sponsorship package, we ask that the optional module on careers in the City be included.

Key Data

10. A pilot was run by FLIC in late 2021 with 200 students from years 10 and 11 at a school in Manchester with relatively high levels of deprivation. Feedback from that pilot showed that 85% of those students who took part would change their approach to budgeting, as well as a 22% increase in the students' confidence in their ability to budget.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

Strategic implications

11. Sponsoring this project aligns well with our key policy priorities of supporting and promoting the UK financial based services sector, cultivating excellence in our schools and helping pupils to reach their full potential as set out in the Corporate Plan 2018-2023.
12. This project would support outcomes 3, 8 and 10 from the Corporate Plan, focusing on equal opportunities, access to skills and talent and inspiring enterprise, excellence, creativity and collaboration. It also supports the City Corporation's focus on improving socio-economic diversity in the financial services sector by ensuring that students from all backgrounds are empowered to manage money effectively.

Financial implications

13. It is proposed that the required funding of £75,000 is drawn from the Committee's 2022/23 Policy Initiatives Fund, categorised under 'Communities' and charged to City's Cash. The current uncommitted balance available within your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund 2022/23 amounts to £687,000 prior to any allowance being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

Resource implications

14. None for CoLC although CoLAT will assess impact on teachers and schools.

Legal implications

15. None

Risk implications

16. None

Equalities implications

17. None

Climate implications

18. None

Security implications

19. None

Conclusion

20. Supporting the Financial Literacy and Inclusion Campaign's project to deliver financial literacy education in schools would make a difference to the ability of young people in CoLAT schools and across London to manage money. It would also support the City Corporation's Corporate Plan to contribute to a flourishing society, support a thriving economy and shape outstanding environments.

Appendices

None

Sarah Bridgman

Corporate Affairs Officer

T: 07395 799181

E: sarah.bridgman@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Committee(s): Policy and Resources Committee – For decision	Dated: 17/02/2022
Subject: Franco-British Young Leaders’ Programme – Gala Dinner 2022	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	Outcomes 5-8
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Yes
If so, how much?	£20,000
What is the source of Funding?	Policy Initiatives Fund 2022/23
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?	Agreed, subject to P&R Approval
Report of: Bob Roberts, Executive Director of Communications and External Affairs	For Decision
Report author: Sarah Bridgman, Corporate Affairs Officer	

Summary

This report proposes that the City of London Corporation sponsors the Franco-British Council’s Young Leaders’ Programme Gala Dinner in 2022.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Approve the City Corporation’s sponsorship of the Franco-British Council’s Young Leaders’ Programme Gala Dinner for 2022/23 in the amount of £20,000, to be met from the Committee’s 2022/23 Policy Initiatives Fund, charged to City’s Cash.

Main Report

Background

1. The Franco-British Council (FBC) is an independent non-governmental organisation with charitable status. It was formed to promote better understanding between the United Kingdom and France and to facilitate a constructive dialogue through meetings of leading representatives in the fields of Culture, Science, Education, Politics and Business.

2. The Council enjoys bilateral governance with members and trustees in both countries; it receives funding from both British and French governments and its high-level partners. Some of its partners include: the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères, Eurostar, Gide Loyrette Nouel and Kering.
3. The FBC's Young Leaders' Programme aims to bring together opinion-formers aged between 30 and 40 from a range of sectors to further Franco-British bilateral relations. The programme has been running annually since 2017 and has built up a large alumni network.
4. The FBC is looking to hold its annual Gala Dinner in June 2022 in Guildhall as it did in 2017 and 2019. The City Corporation would provide the venue and associated hire costs and catering in return for appropriate branding opportunities and to give a welcome speech at the dinner.
5. Examples of former Young Leaders include: Clément Beaune, French Secretary of State for European Affairs; Alicia Kearns, Member of Parliament; Alison McGovern, Member of Parliament; and Alexandre Holroyd, Député, French National Assembly.

Proposals

6. The proposal is to support the Franco-British Council's Young Leaders' Programme through hosting the Gala Dinner in Guildhall in June 2022 for approximately 100 high level guests including the Ambassadors of both nations. The City Corporation would also invite a number of guests to the dinner.
7. The Policy Chair will provide opening remarks and a high-level speaker will address the dinner.
8. A key benefit of the City's engagement would be the opportunity to build up ongoing relations with France's future political and business leaders. The Franco-British Council is also the Secretariat for the All-Party Parliamentary Group for France and works closely with the Franco-British Chamber for Great Britain and other Franco-British organisations. Representatives from these organisations will also be invited to the Gala Dinner.
9. The hosting of this dinner aligns well with our key corporate policy priority of supporting and promoting the City's financial services sector, as well as maintaining good relations with a key foreign partner.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

Strategic implications

10. In hosting the Gala Dinner, the City Corporation would demonstrate its commitment to furthering the Anglo-French dialogue.

11. The City Corporation would receive branding opportunities, a speaking slot at the dinner and recognition of its sponsorship of the programme.

Financial implications

12. It is proposed that the required funding of £20,000 is drawn from the Committee's 2022/23 Policy Initiatives Fund, categorised under 'Events' and charged to City's Cash. The current uncommitted balance available within your Committee's Policy Initiatives Fund 2022/23 amounts to £687,000 prior to any allowance being made for any other proposals on today's agenda.

Resource implications

13. None

Legal implications

14. None

Risk implications

15. None

Equalities implications

16. None

Climate implications

17. None

Security implications

18. Strategic Security Director Richard Woolford has been informed.

Conclusion

19. The Policy and Resources Committee is therefore recommended to approve £20,000 for sponsorship of the Franco-British Young Leaders Programme Gala Dinner.

Appendices

None

Sarah Bridgman

Corporate Affairs Officer

T: 07395 799181

E: sarah.bridgman@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 9

Committee(s)	Dated:
Policy and Resources	17 February 2022
Subject: City Corporation contribution to London Tourism Recovery Marketing (international campaign)	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	7 and 10
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Y
If so, how much?	£50,000
What is the source of Funding?	Policy Initiatives Fund
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Agreed, subject to P&R approval
Report of: Damian Nussbaum, Director of Innovation and Growth	For Decision
Report author: Nick Bodger, Cultural and Visitor Development Director	

Summary

This report responds to a request from the London Tourism Recovery Board for £50,000 towards an international marketing campaign that seeks to drive visitor footfall from overseas to central London this summer so retaining and supporting jobs across its leisure sector.

Your Committee approved a contribution of £50,000 to the Board's domestic campaign in April last year which delivered significant results driving incremental visits from UK holidaymakers to London worth £70m, equating to an ROI of 18:1

Together with funds from Government, the Mayor of London and other industry partners, a total funding pot of £15m is sought for this internationally focussed work, with the majority of this funding now secured.

Targets for this new international campaign include delivery of incremental visits to London worth £144m, which would equate to an ROI of 10:1, and an audience reach of 60-70% of potential US, French and German visitors (which are London's top 3 markets by volume and spend).

International visitors accounted for 84% of London's tourism spend prior to the pandemic and driving demand from this sector is vital for London's and the City's attractions which rely heavily on overseas visitors.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- Approve funds of £50,000 in support of a major international tourism campaign, payable to London and Partners and promoting central London to

visitors, to be taken from your Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF) in the 2021/22 financial year categorised as 'Promoting the City' and charged to City's Cash.

Main Report

Background

1. The London Tourism Recovery Board (LTRB) was set up to ensure Government funding and industry activity is directed in a way that will ensure the maximum number of jobs are protected within London's tourism sector as we emerge from the pandemic, noting that tourism represented 1 in 7 jobs in the capital pre-Covid and that many of these remain at risk if visitor footfall stays at current levels.
2. In April 2021, your Committee approved funding of £50,000 towards the LTRB's domestic campaign, which sought to drive UK visitors to central London in a bid to close the gap left by visitors from overseas as travel restrictions remained in play. The campaign ran from May to October 2021 and was funded by the combined pooling of resources of organisations working in central London's tourism sector, with a total funding pot of £3.9m being achieved.
3. The domestic campaign – *Let's Do London* – delivered significant results driving incremental visits to London worth £70m which equated to an ROI of 18:1. It was delivered by London and Partners.
4. The City Corporation has been at the heart of London's tourism recovery as we have moved through the pandemic. It has been an active member on the London Tourism Recovery Board (represented by your Cultural and Visitor Development Director) since the Board's inception and has benefitted from being able to direct the strategy and set the brief for London's tourism sector as well as participate in the domestic marketing campaign (as above).
5. Other destinations on the Board include the Royal Borough of Greenwich, Southbank BID, New West End Company, Heart of London Business Alliance, Grosvenor Estates, The Crown Estate and Shaftesbury PLC along with private sector hotels, attractions, hospitality and arts providers.
6. This report responds to a second request from the LTRB. The request is for £50,000, £100,000 or £500,000 towards a marketing campaign that seeks to drive international visitor footfall to central London this summer, with contributor benefits aligned to the level of funding selected. The campaign will, again, be managed by London and Partners.
7. Similar requests have been made to all Board members.
8. As a large-scale provider and funder of attractions within central London (eg Tower Bridge, Museum of London, Barbican, Monument and Guildhall Art Gallery), it is strongly anticipated the City Corporation will contribute noting the benefits of participation for its services and visitor economy.
9. International visitors accounted for 84% of London's tourism spend prior to the pandemic and driving demand from this sector is vital for London's and the City's attractions which rely heavily on overseas visitors (for example, 79% of

City Information Centre footfall pre-pandemic comprised international audiences).

10. The City has consistently been the worst hit and slowest area to recover across London. The figures for 2020 were particularly bad with a fall from 21m to 4.6m visitors to the Square Mile, and a spend of £409m, down from £2.1bn. There has not been a strong improvement since then:
 - Recreation and retail footfall has averaged 23% since 1 April 2020. Whilst the worker footfall so critical to sustaining amenities in the City had started to recover faster in autumn 2021 - up to a weekly average of 75% of normal daily footfall and one of the highest in London - this has again plummeted with Omicron restrictions (to a low of 18%).
 - Spending in the Square Mile has averaged 31%, making it the hardest hit of all local authority areas. (FT January 2022).

Current Position

11. This new campaign targeting international visitors takes a similar approach to that of the domestic campaign in that it seeks to deliver an ambitious £15m funding pot through the combined pooling of resources.
12. On 25 January 2022, the UK Government issued a press release describing the UK to be 'one of the most open countries in Europe and ready for an international tourism boom'. Within the release it detailed VisitBritain's £10m international marketing campaign which will promote the UK's cities, whose visitor economies have been most detrimentally affected by the consequences of the pandemic, as well as 'another side of Britain'; the latter being a strategy which the Government wishes to pursue as part of its ambition to spread the economic benefits of tourism and in pursuit of its 'levelling-up' agenda.
13. The campaign will take a dual-pronged approach for London, one part featuring the capital in a wider VisitBritain campaign, another delivering a dedicated international campaign for London through London and Partners, using money pledged by the Mayor of London, an anticipated £5m raised from industry contributions, and £5m in Value-in-Kind (VIK) and 'contributed media' (for example, media exchanges with target cities such as New York).
14. Targets for the campaign include delivery of incremental visits to London worth £144m, which would equate to an ROI of 10:1, and an audience reach of 60-70% of potential US, French and German visitors (which are London's top 3 markets by volume and spend).

Options

15. As discussed above, organisations such as the City are being asked to contribute at one of three funding levels: £50,000, £100,000 or £500,000.
 - a. **At the £50,000 level:** the City Corporation retains its seat on the LTRB, and, as such, has an opportunity to influence the recovery agenda to ensure that City priorities are met – specifically to drive footfall to the City and sustain the SMEs in the retail, hospitality and

tourism sectors – essential elements in creating an attractive destination for investment. In addition, it will continue to have access to valuable data and insights to better inform its own work. This is the recommended option.

- b. **At the £100,000 level:** contributors at this level receive the above benefits plus their product/brand being featured on Visitlondon.com and/or in partner campaign assets as well as the option to retarget campaign audiences with their own paid media campaign. This option is not recommended because the City Corporation already enjoys the benefits of being featured on Visitlondon.com through its Partner membership status and because it is unlikely that it will fund a paid media campaign of its own at a level that would achieve any significant benefit.
- c. **At the £500,000 level:** contributors at this level receive all of the above benefits plus their product featured in the paid media campaign. Again, this option is not recommended for the reasons above and because the funding level would unlikely reward the City Corporation with benefits commensurate with the additional monies required, noting its offer and scope is restricted to the City area and the assets it manages.

Proposals

- 16. After due consideration by officers, it is proposed that the City Corporation contributes £50,000 to the LTRB's international campaign aligned with other similar-level industry providers in central London and noting that the benefits of other levels may only be achieved if the City Corporation were to invest significantly more in paid media campaigns of its own.
- 17. It should be noted that, were this contribution to be approved, it does not buy the City Corporation exposure for its own assets directly within campaigns (albeit some may be featured); rather the contribution is made in support of central London's tourism and leisure sectors, with benefit derived from increased footfall within the central London area (delivering "knock-on" benefits for the City). That said, some "City" locations and assets – such as Tower Bridge – are amongst London's most iconic sights and so may receive coverage within the campaign regardless.
- 18. To not invest is not recommended in that it would remove the City Corporation from the campaign (and the LTRB) completely, with no opportunity to steer or influence strategy.
- 19. It is therefore proposed that the £50,000 be awarded in support of a major international tourism campaign managed by London and Partners and promoting central London to overseas visitors, to be taken from your Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF) in the 2021/22 financial year.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

- **Strategic implications:** the proposals align with Corporate Plan outcomes 7 and 10 in that they help to support the City (and wider London) as a global centre for culture and promote our world-class heritage assets, cultural experiences and events.

The proposals also support core outcomes under the Vibrant Offer dimension of the City's Recovery Strategy [Square Mile: Future City](#) in that they encourage overseas leisure visitors to return to the City and they support City leisure-sector organisations.

- **Financial implications:** it is proposed that £50,000 be awarded to the LTRB through London and Partners in support of a major international tourism campaign promoting central London to visitors, to be taken from your Policy Initiatives Fund (PIF) in the 2021/22 financial year categorised as 'Promoting the City' and charged to City's Cash.

The current uncommitted balance of the 2021/22 Policy Initiative Fund is £312,307 prior to any allowance being made for any proposals at your February 2022 meeting.

- **Resource implications:** none identified.
- **Legal implications:** a standard funding contract will be drawn up by London and Partners for consideration by your Comptroller.
- **Risk implications:** despite best efforts, marketing targeting the identified groups is unlikely to mitigate all sector job losses across London.
- **Equalities implications:** none identified.
- **Climate implications:** none identified
- **Security implications:** none identified

Conclusion

20. There is an urgent need for London's tourism sector to move at speed to help protect sector jobs by driving the right people into the right businesses, addressing the footfall losses anticipated in central London this summer.
21. Commitment to the campaign described in this paper has already been given by many of London's tourism operators and – should enough contribute – it is anticipated that the target £5m industry partner pot (contributing to an overall £15m spend figure for the campaign) will be achieved.

Background papers

- City Corporation contribution to London Tourism Recovery Marketing; paper considered by you Policy and Resources Committee under urgency in April 2021.

Nick Bodger

Cultural and Visitor Development Director
Innovation & Growth

E: Nick.Bodger@cityoflondon.gov.uk

T: 07773 766 846

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Policy and Resources Committee	Dated: 17/02/2022
Subject: Commonwealth Games Baton Relay Celebrations	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	Corporate Plan outcomes 3b, 4a, 7c, 10d, 12a.
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	Y
If so, how much?	£70,000
What is the source of Funding?	PIF
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Y
Report of: Bob Roberts, Director of Communications	For Decision
Report author: Sam Hutchings, Sport Engagement Manager	

Summary

This summer the Commonwealth Games will take place in Birmingham and, in the lead up to this high-profile event, the Queen's Baton will wind its way across the globe to arrive in the Square Mile in early June. This report provides an update on plans for the City Corporation to celebrate this occasion through business and community focused events that will receive widespread public and media attention. A request is made to fund this activity and cover the costs involved in delivering a successful and worthwhile event.

Recommendation

Members are asked to:

- Agree that £70,000 be allocated from the 2022/23 Policy Initiatives Fund to cover costs associated with events to celebrate the Commonwealth Games' Queen's Baton Relay in the City of London

Main Report

Background

1. The City Corporation has a long history of supporting and celebrating Major Sport Events in the UK. Recent research undertaken by the City Corporation and UK Sport shows how important these events are to the soft power and trade position of the UK. This is particularly important as the UK enters a new phase in its diplomacy and trade development. It is within that context that the City Corporation is seeking to maximise its engagement during the Commonwealth Games in Birmingham this year. The Sport Engagement Manager is working with relevant partners to deliver a number of events during this time, including plans to celebrate the Baton Relay in London.

Baton Relay Celebrations

2. The Queens' Baton Relay, similar to the Olympic Torch Relay, is a celebration of the upcoming Commonwealth Games taking place in Birmingham this summer. The aim is to drive up public interest and engagement in the Games from across the Commonwealth as we approach the start of the competition. The Baton is currently travelling through all the countries in the Commonwealth and will return to the UK in May 2022 to make its final journey to the opening ceremony. The City of London has been approached by the organisers of the Relay to host the Baton over the weekend of the Platinum Jubilee. This could potentially involve the receipt of the Baton at Guildhall at the time of the reception as well as other events over that weekend.
3. Key City partners and stakeholders will be involved in the preparations of these celebrations, including relevant cultural institutions, local schools as well as the Cheapside Business Improvement District and the London Stock Exchange. The Baton will also visit landmarks such as the Houses of Parliament, the Royal Docks and the Tower of London over that weekend and is likely to receive a great deal of public and media attention. Supporting these events will help deliver on the City Corporation's aim to encourage interest and focus on the Square Mile's retail and leisure offerings to a wide and diverse audience. It will also enable the City Corporation to engage with its local community and promote the wide-ranging benefits of sport and physical activity.
4. The City's Sport Engagement Manager is working with the organisers of the Baton Relay, along with local and national stakeholders, to explore options to host the Baton and ensure this important occasion is celebrated appropriately within the Square Mile. This is likely to include a business focused event at Tower Bridge on the evening of Friday 3rd June 2022 and also a community focused event in Paternoster Square on Saturday 4th June 2022. This latter event is likely to draw a large crowd to watch an outdoor cultural / sport related performance in the afternoon. Mindful of the exceptional scale of this event and the likely attention it will receive from the public and media, it is essential that the celebrations are

delivered and managed successfully with appropriate resources in place to support this.

Financial Implications

5. Owing to of the scale and profile of the events being proposed to celebrate the Baton Relay, it is anticipated that the costs involved in putting on a successful event will be approximately £70,000 and cannot be found from existing budgets. This amount would cover expenditure involved in event management, local community engagement and promotion, event production and related security and safety measures. It is therefore suggested that Members agree an allocation of £70,000 from its 2022/23 Policy Initiatives Fund towards events to celebrate the Commonwealth Games Queen's Baton Relay, categorised as 'Events' and charged to City's Cash. The current uncommitted balance in the 2022/23 Policy Initiative Fund is £687,000 prior to any allowances being made for any other proposals on today's agenda

Corporate & Strategic Implications

6. Strategic implications – this proposal aligns with and will support the delivery of the Corporate Plan, particularly around making the Square Mile an attractive destination.

Financial implications – costs as outlined in this report.

Resource implications - additional staffing resources may be needed over the bank holiday weekend.

Legal implications - none

Risk implications – a full assessment will be undertaken of all risks related to the events in the City over the bank holiday weekend.

Equalities implications – none

Climate implications - none

Security implications – these will be considered by the City Corporation in conjunction with the City of London Police and other external bodies.

Conclusion

7. This report provides an update to Members on the City Corporation's plans to celebrate the Queens Baton Relay as part of the Commonwealth Games preparations. Members are asked to agree an allocation of £70,000 from the Policy Initiatives Fund towards the costs of a business and community focused event. Members of your Public Relations Sub Committee, which has responsibility for Sport Engagement matters in the Square Mile, will be provided with more details on plans for these events as they develop and will review when they next meet at the end of May 2022.

Sam Hutchings

Sport Engagement Manager

E: sam.hutchings@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Policy and Resources	Dated: 17 February 2022
Subject: Pension Committee – Proposed Terms of Reference, Membership and Operation	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	All
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
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: The Chamberlain	For Decision
Report author: Kate Limna – Corporate Treasurer	

Summary

At your November 2021 meeting, Members considered a report covering the committee structure proposals arising from the Governance Review (Governance Review: Committee Structure Considerations). Within that report, Members were asked to consider the creation of a new body to have responsibility for discharging the Corporation’s responsibilities as an administering authority of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS). The creation of such a committee had been raised during the Member engagement process for the Governance Review.

At that meeting Members agreed to the creation of a Pension Committee, noting that a report would be brought back specifying terms of reference and membership arrangements (modelled on best practice across the sector). This was subsequently endorsed by the Court of Common Council in December 2021.

This report now sets out the proposed terms of reference, membership and meeting arrangements for the new Pension Committee, based on best practice arrangements across the sector.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- (i) note the report; and
- (ii) agree to the proposed terms of reference, membership and operational arrangements as set out in the report and in Appendix 1

Main Report

Background

1. The Corporation has a distinct and separate role from its other functions as an administering authority of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS). As an administering authority the Corporation is responsible for operating the Pension Fund, establishing investment arrangements and employer contribution rates that safeguard the payment of benefits to scheme members as and when they fall due. The administering authority must also safeguard the solvency of the Fund through periodic actuarial valuations; actively manage risks around potential employer default; and monitor all aspects of the Fund's performance.
2. The Pension Fund has investment assets valued at £1.3bn and estimated liabilities of £1.4bn (as at 31 March 2021), making this a key area of risk for the organisation. At present, responsibility for discharging this role resides variously with the Investment Committee (via the Financial Investment Board), the Establishment Committee, and the Finance Committee. Whilst these arrangements have enabled the Corporation to fulfil its statutory responsibilities satisfactorily to date, regulatory guidance is that governance should be improved further via the establishment of a dedicated Pension Committee with decision-making powers (it should be noted that the role of the existing non-executive Local Government Pension Board is to scrutinise decision making, so it cannot absorb this function).
3. Although not a strictly mandatory requirement, Pension Committees are the overwhelmingly dominant mode of governance across the LGPS and the City Corporation is increasingly out of alignment in failing to manage its arrangements in this way (it is believed that we may be the only body operating under differing arrangements).
4. A separate Pension Committee ensures that all key strategic decisions are taken by one body, supporting streamlined, consistent and aligned decision-making across the function. It also cultivates, in one place, the specific knowledge and understanding needed to effectively oversee the Pension Fund in its entirety. Finally, it allows the administering authority to manage potential conflicts of interest and to demonstrate to external stakeholders, in a transparent and straightforward manner, that decisions are taken in the interests of scheme members and employers without privileging the host authority. If agreed, one of the first activities for this new Committee would be to carry out the next triennial actuarial valuation and the resultant investment strategy review.

Proposals

5. The Pension Committee will be formed under s101 of the Local Government Act 1972 and will exercise, on behalf of the City of London Corporation, all of the powers and duties in relation to its functions as the Scheme Manager and Administering Authority for the City of London Corporation Pension Fund ("the Fund"). The Pension Committee will exercise its functions in accordance with the fiduciary duties of the Corporation as the administering authority of the City of

London Corporation Pension Fund. This will necessitate a series of consequential changes to the terms of reference of other committees, which will be dealt with through the “white paper” process in the usual way and which are highlighted below.

6. The Pension Committee’s overarching responsibility is the safeguarding of the assets and payment of pensions. In keeping with this, it should be noted that any policy decision made by the Court of Common Council that affects the Pension Committee will need to be considered by that Committee (see paragraph 17 for further detail).
7. The following sections set out the proposed terms of reference, membership, and operational arrangements in detail and which are summarised in Appendix 1. Officers have reviewed the terms of reference and membership of the Pension Committees operating within other London Authorities and have drawn on these for best practice.

Terms of Reference

8. The Terms of Reference for the Pension Committee will be as follows:
 - a) To undertake statutory functions on behalf of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) and ensure compliance with the Local Government Pensions Scheme Regulations (“the Regulations”), relevant legislation, and best practice as advised by the Pensions Regulator.
 - b) To formulate, publish and periodically review strategies and policies around the Pension Fund, for example (but not limited to) investments, responsible investment, funding and administration.
 - c) To select and appoint suitability qualified external service providers, such as investment managers and advisors as required.
 - d) To monitor the Fund’s investment arrangements including asset allocation, the performance of investment managers and advisors, and asset pooling arrangements (noting that the Pension Fund is a shareholder of the London CIV pool).
 - e) To monitor liabilities, make arrangements for the triennial actuarial valuation of the Fund, and to consider and approve the required employer contribution levels for each employer within the Fund.
 - f) To deal with the admission and cessation of employers as and when necessary and to review the ability of admitted bodies to meet their obligations to the Fund.
 - g) To ensure the Corporation effectively discharges its obligations to scheme members and employers as an administering authority.
 - h) To consider and approve the Pension Fund’s Annual Report as well as all other statutory statements required under the Regulations.
 - i) To work with, receive and consider comments from the Local Government Pensions Board (a scrutiny and non-decision-making body established under the Regulations) in pursuit of good governance of the LGPS.

- j) To ensure that arrangements are in place for consultation with stakeholders as necessary.
- k) To develop and maintain the appropriate level of knowledge and understanding to carry out their duties effectively (including completion of the Pensions Regulator's Public Service toolkit).

Membership

- 9. In determining the appropriate membership arrangements for the Pension Committee, officers have reviewed how other London local authorities are constituted to identify best practice. The number of elected members on a Pension Committee across peer authorities reviewed varies from 4 to 10 with some additionally appointing one or two independent members (who are generally non-voting). To ensure continuity on the Pension Committee, Members will have staggered terms but with a maximum of 3 terms of up to 4 years.
- 10. Whilst training will be provided, Members will be expected to complete the Pension Regulator's Public Services Toolkit within 12 months of joining the Committee and to keep their knowledge up to date.
- 11. It is proposed that the Membership of the Pension Committee will be as follows:
 - a) The Pension Committee will be composed of up to 8 elected Members who shall be nominated by the Court of Common Council.
 - b) Up to 3 non-voting independent members may be co-opted on to the Pension Committee (particularly around certain skill bases) on the advice of the Chamberlain.
 - c) The Chair and Deputy Chair are to be determined by the Pension Committee and must be elected Members.
 - d) The quorum is any three elected Members of the Pension Committee.
 - e) No Member of the Pension Committee shall be a Member of the Local Government Pensions Board, be the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Establishment Committee, the Finance Committee or the Policy and Resources Committee simultaneously.
- 12. It is recognised that this is a slightly smaller Committee than the 12-15 optimal size recommended for most Committees/Boards through the Governance Review process. Nevertheless, given the experience of others across the sector and desire to replicate best practice, a somewhat reduced membership is recommended for this Committee.

Operational Arrangements

- 13. It is proposed that the Pension Committee shall meet a minimum of 4 times per year (1 April to 31 March), with the expectation that it may meet more frequently in the first two years and in years when, for example, there is an actuarial valuation.

14. At its first meeting the Pension Committee will be expected to elect a Chair and Deputy Chair and to review the current policies (both investment and administrative) of the Pension Fund.
15. There are a number of activities involved with the administration of the LGPS that are currently discharged by officers under the remit of various committees, and which will now fall under the remit of the Pension Committee. This will be continued for the purpose of operational efficiency and overseen by the Pension Committee. Therefore, unless reserved for the Pension Committee or the Court of Common Council, the Pension Committee will delegate all Pension Fund matters to the Chamberlain and Section 151 Officer and, as appropriate, the Chamberlain will delegate aspects of the role to other officers of the City Corporation including the Corporate Treasurer.

Impact on Other Committees/Boards

16. Currently, responsibility for pension matters broadly fall to the Financial Investment Board and Finance Committee. All such matters will now come under the remit of the Pension Committee. This includes but is not limited to the following:
 - The appointment and monitoring of fund managers, asset allocation, setting and reviewing investment strategy (including responsible investment), authorisation of investments and approving parameters within which the fund managers will be authorised to operate, investment of all new Pension Fund monies – currently with the Financial Investment Board but will move to the Pension Committee
 - Arrangement for the triennial actuarial valuation and approval of the employer contribution levels for each employer within the Pension Fund - currently with the Finance Committee but will move to the Pension Committee
 - Dealing with the admission and cessation of employers as admitted bodies to the Pension Fund – currently with the Finance Committee but will move to the Pension Committee.
17. It should be noted that whilst it would be the expectation and intention that corporate policies are applied in respect of the Pension Committee's activities, such matters must always be considered in light of the specific regulatory requirements that apply to the administration of the LGPS. Therefore, where relevant and insofar as such policies impact the Pension Fund, they will need to be reviewed by the Pension Committee. For the avoidance of doubt this does not introduce any new limitation on corporate policymaking and under current governance arrangements LGPS regulatory requirements are already taken into consideration when formulating policies that impact the Pension Fund.

Local Government Pension Board

18. As Members will be aware, there is a separate Local Government Pensions Board (LGP Board) within the existing governance structure. This is an advisory Board and does not have decision making powers. In line with the requirements of the Public Services Pensions Act 2013 for the management of the City of London

Corporation's Pension Scheme, the Board is responsible for assisting the Scheme Manager (the City of London Corporation) in the following matters:

- a) securing compliance with the scheme regulations and other legislation relating to the governance and administration of the scheme and any statutory pension scheme that it is connected to;
- b) securing compliance with requirements imposed in relation to the scheme and any connected scheme by the Pensions Regulator; and
- c) other such matters as the scheme regulations may specify

19. The LGP Board will, therefore, play a vital and complimentary role in scrutinising the work of the Pension Committee.

Conclusion

20. Pension Committees are the overwhelmingly dominant mode of governance across the LGPS and the City Corporation is increasingly out of alignment in not managing its arrangements in this way. The creation of a separate Pension Committee will ensure that all key strategic decisions are taken by one body, supporting streamlined, consistent and aligned decision-making across the function. It will cultivate, in one place, the specific knowledge and understanding needed to effectively oversee the Pension Fund in its entirety.

21. It will also allow the administering authority to manage potential conflicts of interest and to demonstrate to external stakeholders, in a transparent and straightforward manner, that decisions are taken in the interests of scheme members and employers without privileging the host authority.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Proposed Terms of Reference

Background Papers

18/11/2021 P&R Cttee Governance Review; Committee Structure Considerations

Kate Limna

Corporate Treasurer

T: 020 7332 3952

E: kate.limna@cityoflondon.gov.uk

PENSION COMMITTEE – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Constitution

A non-ward committee consisting of:

- Up to 8 Members elected by the Court of Common Council , at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment
- Up to 3 non-voting independent members (i.e. non-Members of the Court of Common Council) co-opted to the Committee on the advice of the Chamberlain

N.B. - No Member of the Pension Committee shall be a Member of the Local Government Pensions Board, be the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Establishment Committee, the Finance Committee, or the Policy & Resources Committee simultaneously

2. Quorum

The quorum consists of any three elected Members.

3. Membership

Subject to election by the Court of Common Council, April 2022.

4. Terms of Reference

To undertake statutory functions on behalf of the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS) and ensure compliance with the Local Government Pensions Scheme Regulations (“the Regulations”), relevant legislation, and best practice as advised by the Pensions Regulator.

To be responsible for:-

- l) formulating, publishing and periodically review strategies and policies around the Pension Fund, for example (but not limited to) investments, responsible investment, funding, and administration.
- m) selecting and appointing suitability qualified external service providers, such as investment managers and advisors as required.
- n) monitoring the Pension Fund’s investment arrangements including asset allocation, the performance of investment managers and advisors, and asset pooling arrangements (noting that the Pension Fund is a shareholder of the London CIV pool).
- o) monitoring liabilities, making arrangements for the triennial actuarial valuation of the Pension Fund, and considering and approving the required employer contribution levels for each employer within the Fund.

- p) dealing with the admission and cessation of employers as and when necessary and to review the ability of admitted bodies to meet their obligations to the Pension Fund.
- q) ensuring the Corporation effectively discharges its obligations to scheme members and employers as an administrating authority.
- r) considering and approving the Pension Fund's Annual Report as well as all other statutory statements required under the Regulations.
- s) working with, receiving and considering comments from the Local Government Pensions Board (a scrutiny and non-decision-making body established under the Regulations) in pursuit of good governance of the LGPS.
- t) ensuring that arrangements are in place for consultation with stakeholders as necessary.
- u) developing and maintaining the appropriate level of knowledge and understanding to carry out their duties effectively (including completion of the Pensions Regulator's Public Service toolkit).

NOTE: whilst it is the expectation and intention that corporate policies are applied in respect of the Pension Committee's activities, such matters must always be considered in light of the specific regulatory requirements that apply to the administration of the LGPS. Therefore, where relevant and insofar as such policies impact the Pension Fund, they will need to be reviewed by the Pension Committee.

Committee(s)	Dated:
Police Authority Board Streets & Walkways Sub Committee Policy & Resources Committee	27 January 2022 15 February 2022 17 February 2022
Subject: Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
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: Director of the Environment	For Information
Report author: Ian Hughes, Deputy Director, Transportation & Public Realm	

Summary

The City’s permanent Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order (ATTRO) authorises the City Police to potentially control the movement of pedestrians and vehicles on City streets for counter terrorism purposes and was originally requested as part of a package of measures aimed at both improving the security of people in crowded places & preventing damage to buildings from a potential terrorist attack.

Members approved the ATTRO in 2016 on the basis that the City Corporation’s area was particularly vulnerable to terrorism due to its highly dense nature and the concentration of high profile, historic, prestigious and financial targets that can be found throughout the Square Mile.

Matters since would suggest this assessment has not changed, albeit the use of the ATTRO has been limited to a small number of high-profile special events. As a result, in February 2020 Members agreed to approve the retention of the ATTRO for a further three years before its continuing use would be reviewed and decided upon again in 2023.

Due to the large-scale cancellation of events in 2021 due to COVID-19, the ATTRO was not used at all in the last 12 months, but from a City Police perspective, retaining the permanent ATTRO remains important because it affords them the ability to react quickly, if the intelligence necessitates it, to protect the public.

Recommendation(s)

Members are recommended to receive this report.

Main Report

Background

1. In September and October 2016, the Planning & Transportation Committee (for decision), the Police Committee (for information) and the Policy & Resources Committee (for decision) discussed and agreed to the creation of an Anti-Terrorism Traffic Regulation Order (ATTRO) in the City Corporation area.
2. This was in response to a request from the Commissioner of the City Police in July 2015 to introduce such an order and followed a statutory public consultation.
3. The Commissioner's request was informed by advice received from his counter-terrorism security advisors, including the Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (CPNI). The advice related to the whole administrative area of the City and was in the context of the potential impact of terrorism due to the City's intensely crowded nature and its role as a high-profile world centre of economic activity.
4. The ATTRO is a counter terrorism measure pursuant to the provisions of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004, which allows traffic orders to be written by the Traffic Authority under s6, s22C and s22D of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. These orders can only be made on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Police, and are for the purposes of:
 - a. Avoiding or reducing the likelihood of, or danger connected with, terrorism, or;
 - b. Preventing or reducing damage connected with terrorism.
5. On the basis of a security assessment or an intelligence threat, the ATTRO gives a City Police Inspector or above the discretion to restrict traffic and / or pedestrians to all or part of any street in the City. That discretion must be exercised in accordance with an agreed protocol so that any interference is proportionate and that such restrictions are in place for the minimum extent and time necessary.
6. The Commissioner requested the ATTRO be put in place on a permanent basis, but that its use be contingent on it only being used as a proportional counter terrorism response to the needs of an event, incident or item of intelligence. Transport for London also agreed to allow the City Corporation to include their streets within the Square Mile as part of the ATTRO area.
7. The permanent ATTRO allows the controls to be activated at any time, albeit in accordance with an agreed protocol that reflects the statutory requirements for making such an order. Nevertheless, its permanent nature enables speedier activation of security measures to meet operational requirements given the unpredictability of the current terrorist threat.

8. Members agreed to making the ATTRO on two key conditions, namely that an annual review be presented to Members, and as part of that review, there should be confirmation that the ATTRO had been used in a proportionate way.

Current Position

9. The protocol established for using the ATTRO allowed for two main types of scenario, namely for intelligence-based police led urgent situations and for pre-planned special events. In terms of the former scenario, the permanent City ATTRO has yet to be used to implement controls as a result of advance intelligence.
10. In terms of special events, it was agreed that the ATTRO could be used to supplement the City Corporation and TfL's existing event planning process. This process would typically include a separate pre-advertised temporary traffic regulation order (TTRO) granted to the organiser to close roads just to facilitate the event. In such circumstances, the ATTRO could be used to authorise additional protective security measures, such as the control of pedestrian movements which would not typically form part of the standard event TTRO, and / or additional road closures that might be deemed appropriate nearer the event.
11. Since its introduction in 2016, the City Police Commissioner has only requested that the ATTRO be used on eight separate occasions, all in relation to a particular special event. Four of those requests involved the annual New Year's Eve celebrations as part of the Metropolitan Police-led operation across Central London. The other four were all in 2017 and related to:
 - a. The funeral of PC Keith Palmer at Southwark Cathedral
 - b. The IAAF Marathon
 - c. The Lord Mayor's Show & Fireworks
 - d. The Grenfell Tower Memorial Service at St Paul's Cathedral
12. Post-event feedback would suggest the additional powers contained in the ATTRO were used sparingly and there was no noticeable or negative impact on the general public. In accordance with the agreed protocol, none of the uses of the ATTRO exceeded 48 hours, which would otherwise have triggered a review by the Town Clerk & Commissioner.
13. Due to the large-scale cancellation of events in 2021 due to COVID-19, the ATTRO was not used at all in the last 12 months, but from a City Police perspective, retaining the permanent ATTRO remains important because it affords them the ability to react quickly, if the intelligence necessitates it, to protect the public and that a fair balance is being struck between the public interest and an individual's rights.
14. For these reasons, in February 2020 Members agreed to approve the retention of the ATTRO for a further three years before its continuing use would be reviewed and decided upon again in 2023.
15. Otherwise it should be noted the operational protocol to oversee how the ATTRO is triggered and operated will again be subject to an annual review between the

City Corporation, City Police and TfL under 'Business as Usual' protocols to ensure it remains fit for purpose.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

16. Counter Terrorism is graded as a tier one threat against our country as per the National Strategic Policing Requirements set by the Home Office. Nationally and locally, there is an appropriately strong expectation that the threat of terrorism is met by an equally appropriate and proportionate response by the police and their partners.
17. The Government's Contest Strategy aims to reduce the risk to the UK and its interests overseas from terrorism, so people can go about their daily lives freely and with confidence. The City of London Police, part of the London counter terrorism region, supports the Contest Strategy through the four P's approach of Pursue, Prevent, Protect and Prepare. Protective Security as a theme, and therefore the ATTRO, fits firmly under Protect element of the Government's Contest Strategy.
18. The number one ambition of the City of London Police's Corporate Plan is 'to make the City of London the safest place in the world'. This includes having all the tools available to rapidly mitigate risk and to protect the public.
19. The City of London's historical, cultural and economic importance means it will always be an attractive target for those who are intent on causing high profile disruption. By continuing to protect the City of London from terrorism we will continue to protect the UK's interests as a whole. In terms of prevention, the City of London Police plan states 'we will continue to develop different ways to engage and work with partners in a coordinated way to deter, detect and disrupt terrorist activity'.
20. The City of London Local Plan 2015 aims to ensure that the City remains a safe place to live, work and visit. Core Strategic Policy CS3 makes specific provision for implementing measures to enhance the collective security of the City against terrorist threats, applying measures to broad areas, including the City as a whole. The Policy also encourages the development of area-based approaches to implementing security measures.
21. The risk of terrorist attack remains at the top of the current Corporate Strategic Risk Register because of the City's concentration of high profile, historic, prestigious and financial targets. In addition, the City's Corporate Plan 2018-2023 reiterates the key aims of ensuring people are safe & feel safe and that we protect the users of our buildings, streets & public spaces.
22. Otherwise, the legal implications on the use of the ATTRO remain unchanged from the original 2016 report and are repeated in Appendix 1 for reference.

Risk Implications

23. Although the risk of further terrorist attacks in the Square Mile cannot be eliminated, the potential availability of the ATTRO to the City Police forms part of the measures available to help mitigate that risk.

Legal Implications

24. See Appendix 1.

Financial, Resource, Climate & Equalities Implications

25. None

Conclusion

26. Given the limited number of occasions on which the ATTRO has been used since 2016 and the limited impact on the general public's freedom of movement on each occasion, the evidence would suggest the ATTRO powers have been used proportionately and to the minimum extent necessary in accordance with both the statutory requirements and Members' wishes.

27. However, due to the exceptional environment of the Square Mile, the City of London remains particularly vulnerable to terrorist attack, and as a result, the City's permanent ATTRO is retained as an appropriate measure to enable the Commissioner of Police to more readily and better protect the City community.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - ATTRO Legal Considerations

Ian Hughes
Deputy Director, Transportation & Public Realm
Environment Department

T: 020 7332 1977

E: ian.hughes@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1 - ATTRO Legal Considerations

1. Statutory power to make the ATTRO – Sections 6, 22C and 22D of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended by the Civil Contingencies Act 2004) enables traffic orders to be put in place by the traffic authority for the purposes of avoiding or reducing the likelihood of danger connected with terrorism, or preventing or reducing damage connected with terrorism.
2. Statutory duties of traffic authority - As traffic and highway authority, the City Corporation has the duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (having regard to the effect on amenities) (S122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) and the duty to secure the efficient use of the road network avoiding congestion and disruption (S16 Traffic Management Act 2004). The Schedule to the ATTRO sets out requirements aimed at meeting these duties by ensuring that any restrictions will be the minimum necessary to remove or reduce the danger and are consistent with the statutory requirements for making such Orders. In implementing the ATTRO the traffic impacts of restricting or prohibiting traffic to roads within the City, including, potentially, pedestrian traffic, should be considered. In the event of a threat, the disruption to traffic flow would also have to be weighed against the threat of more severe disruption and greater risk being caused due to failure to prevent an incident.
3. Further controls - The Schedule to the draft ATTRO requires that in most cases at least seven days' notice of any restrictions must be given to persons likely to be affected (unless this is not possible due to urgency or where the giving of notice might itself undermine the reason for activating the ATTRO), and notice must also in any event be given to the City, TfL and other affected traffic authorities.
4. Human Rights and Proportionality - In considering the request for the ATTRO, there is a duty to act in accordance with the European Convention on Human Rights. In relation to possible restriction of access to property, any interference with Article 1 rights to enjoyment of property must be justified. Interference may be regarded as justified where it is lawful, pursues a legitimate purpose, is not discriminatory, and is necessary. It must also strike a fair balance between the public interest and private rights affected (i.e. be proportionate). It is considered that the public interest in being protected by the existence and operation of the ATTRO can outweigh interference with private rights which is likely to occur when restrictions are in operation. The scope of restrictions must be proportionate and should only last until the likelihood of danger or damage is removed or reduced sufficiently in the judgment of a senior police officer. The Schedule to the ATTRO sets out arrangements (further expanded in the Protocol) for ensuring that any interference is proportionate. Given the risks to life and property which could arise if an incident occurred, and the opportunity provided by the ATTRO to remove or reduce the threat of and/or impacts of incidents, it is considered that the ATTRO can be justified and any resulting interference legitimate.

Committee(s) Policy & Resources Committee	Dated: 17/02/2022
Subject: Decisions taken under delegated authority or urgency powers.	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	See Background Report
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	See Background Report
If so, how much?	See Background Report
What is the source of Funding?	See Background Report
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	See Background Report
Report of: Town Clerk	For Information
Report author: Chris Rumbles, Town Clerk's Department	

Summary

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

Recommendation

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

Main Report

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

Urgent Decision: Indemnities for Officers Serving on Outside Bodies

Background

On 9 June 2011, the Court of Common Council considered a report recommending that the City Corporation provide an Indemnity for Members and officers in respect of ex-officio appointments formally approved by the City Corporation as set out in that report. The Minute of that meeting records that the report was read and agreed to but only makes specific reference to Members serving on outside bodies being indemnified (not officers).

The Directors of Barking Power Limited (BPL) have been asked to sign the S.106 Agreement in respect of the Barking Reach Power Station Site, in order to secure the planning permission for a consolidated market.

The BPL Board has resolved to sign the S.106 Agreement “on the basis that the City will fully indemnify the Company and its directors for all obligations, liabilities, costs and actions arising from the S106”.

Confirmation was, therefore, sought that the 9 June 2011 resolution extended to provision of an Indemnity for officers, such that the BPL Directors are indemnified for all obligations arising from the S106. This will enable the S.106 Agreement to be completed and the planning permission for the consolidated market to be issued.

Urgent approval was therefore sought and granted by the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and a former Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee that: -

- That the provision of an Indemnity by the City Corporation (as agreed by Court of Common Council on 9 June 2011) extends to officers (subject to the limitations in the recommendations in the report of 9 June 2011) including those City officers acting as Directors of Barking Power Limited and Thames Power Services Limited; and
- That the above Indemnity applies to the Directors of Barking Power Limited in respect of all obligations, liabilities, costs and actions arising from the S.106 Agreement between the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham, the City Corporation and BPL in respect of the redevelopment of the former Barking Power Station site for a consolidated market.

Urgent Decision: MIPIM Property Conference March 2022

Background

MIPIM is widely recognised as the world's leading and most influential event for the property sector. It is a global marketplace that offers the opportunity to connect with key players in the industry, from investors to end-users and local government to international corporations. This year between 17,000-20,000 delegates are expected to attend.

The focus of The City Corporation's attendance at the last MIPIM in 2019 centred on the following headline objectives:

- a) Promoting the City to the domestic and international property investment market, incorporating the key messages from this year's research theme: *Locate, Create, Innovate: London in a changing world*
- b) Managing relationships with and extending hospitality to new and existing investors, developers and influencers
- c) Positioning the City as a thought leader in property and place making
- d) Supporting the London stand and related organisations including: London Councils, London First and London Chamber of Commerce

Previous MIPIM programmes have provided an opportunity to fully engage with local and international representatives of the property industry together with high level representatives of other London boroughs and UK cities. It has provided a unique opportunity to engage in the debate relating to key issues and demonstrate how the

City Corporation will provide leadership in taking forward matters of local and international importance.

The programme of City Corporation activities have been extremely well received by those who attended. Due to the value derived from the programme, it is considered that there will be similar opportunities to develop a programme that would be beneficial to the City Corporation's attendance at MIPIM 2022.

This will be the first full MIPIM since Brexit and the start of the global pandemic in 2020 and there will be even greater competition to secure global investment. MIPIM 2022 will provide an opportunity to engage fully with the property industry and specifically global investors where there are expected to make up over 600 delegates amongst the 17,000-20,000 attending

The City Corporation is one of the sponsors of a new "Opportunity London" partnership which includes the GLA, London Councils, London and Partners and London First. There will be a further report relating to our sponsorship of this partnership which will provide more details relating to its purpose and suggested programme of activities. Opportunity London has been established as a vehicle to promote the flow of capital investment into London and it is intended for there to be a soft launch at MIPIM 2022. They will have their own Stand presence and it is considered that the City Corporation should attend in support and for economy reasons do not take a dedicated City Stand. High level representatives of each of the sponsors will attend MIPIM, including Deputy Mayor Jules Pipe and Darren Rodwell on behalf of London Councils.

The attendance at MIPIM by the Chair of Policy and Resources, City Surveyor and the Executive Director Environment will enable the key messages, priorities and strategies to be disseminated to the international property audience. In addition to the London Stand programme, there will also be opportunity to engage with leaders of other cities attending MIPIM and with the Department for International Trade who will be attending in their own stand and will have a complementary programme for which there will be further opportunity for the Chair of Policy and Resources to participate.

Proposal

That the City Corporation attend MIPIM and participate as part of the London Stand where there will be a curated conference programme promoting investment into London. The City will support the attendance of a new "Opportunity London" partnership which is being established to support the promotion of capital investment into London and will be a collaboration between the GLA, London and Partners, London Councils, London First, the City Corporation and private sector property companies.

Given the City elections and non-availability of the Chair of Planning and Transportation and Chair of Property Investment Board, it had been proposed that there be a much smaller representation from the City Corporation's previous attendance of MIPIM with the lead being taken by the Chair of Policy

and Resources Committee with officer support by the City Surveyor, Executive Director Environment, CPAT Manager and a Media Officer. Considering the reduced attendance, the total cost of attending MIPIM will be significantly lower than the previous costs of attending at £21,000 (previously £90k) and will come out of the CPAT and Communications Director local risk budget. Savings will be obtained by not taking the City Model, not taking meeting space on the Stand, not hosting a reception, and reducing the numbers attending.

Urgent approval was therefore sought and granted by the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Deputy Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee that: -

- The City of London Corporation attend MIPIM 2022 with a total budget of £21,000 to be funded via the Communications Director budget (£4000) and from the CPAT budget (£17,000)
2. In accordance with Standing Order 41 (a) and 41 (b), Members are asked to note the recent decision taken by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman.
 3. Copies of background papers concerning these decisions are available from Chris Rumbles on request.

Contact:

Chris Rumbles

Christopher.rumbles@cityoflondon.gov.uk

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank