



Policy and Resources Committee

Date: THURSDAY, 7 JULY 2022
Time: 1.45 pm
Venue: COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

Members:

Munsur Ali	Alderman Ian David Luder
Deputy Rehana Ameer	Alderman & Sheriff Nicholas Lyons
Deputy Randall Anderson (Ex-Officio Member)	Catherine McGuinness
Deputy Keith Bottomley (Deputy Chairman)	Wendy Mead
Tijs Broeke (Vice-Chair)	Deputy Andrien Meyers
Deputy Henry Colthurst (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy Brian Mooney
Deputy Simon Duckworth (Chief Commoner) (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy Alastair Moss (Ex-Officio Member)
Mary Durcan (Vice-Chair)	Benjamin Murphy
Deputy Marianne Fredericks	Ruby Sayed (Ex-Officio Member)
Alderman Timothy Hailes	Alderman Baroness Scotland (Ex-Officio Member)
Caroline Haines	Tom Sleight
Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)	Deputy Sir Michael Snyder
Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy James Thomson
Deputy Shravan Joshi	James Tumbridge
The Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor Vincent Keaveny (Ex-Officio Member)	Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Deputy Edward Lord	Alderman Sir David Wootton

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:
www.youtube.com/watch?v=xbIPEJP1fpM

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

NB: Certain items presented for information have been marked * and will be taken without discussion, unless the Committee Clerk has been informed that a Member has questions or comments prior to the start of the meeting. These for information items have been collated into a supplementary agenda pack and circulated separately.

Part 1 - Public Agenda

1. APOLOGIES

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

3. MINUTES

To consider minutes as follows:-

- a) To agree the public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 9 June 2022 (Pages 7 - 14)
- b) * To note the public minutes of the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 30 May 2022
- c) * To note the draft public minutes of the Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub Committee meeting held on 7 June 2022
- d) * To note the draft public minutes of the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 May 2022
- e) * To note the draft public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting on 17 May 2022
- f) * To note a draft summary of the Competitiveness Advisory Board meeting on 12 May 2022

4. LEAD MEMBERS (POLICY AREAS)

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 15 - 22)

5. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND - APPROVAL OF POLICY CHANGES

Report of the Managing Director of the Bridge House Estate and Chief Charities Officer.

For Decision
(Pages 23 - 46)

6. **FOLLOW-UP PAPER TO RESPONSIBLE PROCUREMENT POLICY UPDATE**

Report of the Chief Operating Officer.

For Decision
(Pages 47 - 50)

7. *** BECKFORD & CASS STATUES INTERPRETATION PROJECT**

Report of the Director of Innovation and Growth.

For Information

8. *** ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY WITH WORLD ECONOMIC FORUM UPDATE**

Report of the Director of Innovation and Growth.

For Information

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

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Information

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

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information

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

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

13. **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

14. 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 9 June 2022 (Pages 51 - 52)
- b) * To note the non-public minutes of the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 30 May 2022
- c) * To note the draft non-public minutes of the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee meeting on 17 May 2022
- d) * To note the draft non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting on 17 May 2022

15. DESTINATION CITY - NEXT STEPS ON IMPLEMENTATION

Report of the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth.

For Decision
(Pages 53 - 58)

16. BARBICAN PODIUM WATERPROOFING, DRAINAGE AND LANDSCAPING WORKS (BEN JONSON, BRETON & CROMWELL HIGHWALK) PHASE 2 - 1ST PRIORITY ZONE

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

For Decision
(Pages 59 - 98)

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

Report of the City Surveyor.

For Decision
(Pages 99 - 106)

18. * BARKING REACH POWER STATION COMPANIES - FUTURE LIQUIDATION AND BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE

Joint report of the Chamberlain and City Surveyor.

For Information

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

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information

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

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

Part 3 - Confidential Agenda

22. **MINUTES**

For Decision

- a) To agree the confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 9 June 2022
- b) To note the confidential minutes of the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee meeting on 17 May 2022

23. **NEGOTIATION WITH THE SMTA IN SUPPORT OF THE MOL AND MCP PROGRAMMES**

Joint report of the City Surveyor, Projects Governance Director, Chief Operating Officer, Markets Director and Chamberlain (TO FOLLOW).

For Decision

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Thursday, 9 June 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 9 June 2022 at 1.45 pm and available to view at www.youtube.com/watch?v=F54bz8CjrCU

Present

Members:

Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)
Deputy Keith Bottomley (Deputy Chairman)
Tijs Broeke (Vice-Chair)
Mary Durcan (Vice-Chair)
Munsur Ali
Deputy Randall Anderson (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Rehana Ameer
Caroline Haines
Deputy Shravan Joshi
Deputy Edward Lord
Alderman Ian Luder
Alderman & Sheriff Nicholas Lyons
Wendy Mead
Deputy Andrien Meyers
Deputy Brian Mooney
Ruby Sayed (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy James Thomson
James Tumbridge
Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Deputy Henry Colthurst (Ex-Officio Member)
Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member)

In Attendance

Henry Pollard

In Attendance (Observing Online)

Ben Murphy
Catherine McGuinness
Marianne Fredericks

Officers:

Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Chamberlain
John Barradell	- Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Michael Cogher	- Comptroller and City Solicitor
Polly Dunn, Clerk	- Town Clerk's Department
Anna Dunne	- City Surveyor's Department
Giles French	- Innovation and Growth Department
Simon McGinn	- City Surveyor's Department
Emma Moore	- Chief Operating Officer
Gregory Moore	- Assistant Town Clerk

Lisa Moore	- Chamberlain's Department
Damian Nussbaum	- Executive Director of Innovation and Growth
Rohit Paul	- Town Clerk's Department
Bob Roberts	- Deputy Town Clerk
Chris Rumbles	- Town Clerk's Department
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department
Genine Whitehorne	- Chief Operating Officer's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Sir David Wootton, Alderman Tim Hailes, Catherine McGuinness and the Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor Vincent Keaveny.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

- a) The public minutes and non-public summary of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 5th May 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

Matters Arising

Virtual Online Attendance – Acknowledging that Members observing online do not count toward quoracy (for Committees exercising Local Authority functions) it was proposed that a section be added to minutes to include a list of those Members observing the meeting online. Members agreed that this approach would be adopted across all City Corporation committees to ensure a consistency of approach.

RESOLVED: That Members:-

- Agreed that Members joining a committee meeting virtually should their name recorded in the minutes of the meeting, with this approach being adopted across all City Corporation Committees.

City and Guilds – A Member referred to the question they had raised relating to the City Corporation's contribution to City Guilds not having been answered and the Chairman confirmed someone would come back on this point.

4. **APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEE TO THE CROSSRAIL ARTS FOUNDATION**

The Committee considered a proposal to nominate a Director to serve on the Crossrail Arts Foundation, a company established jointly by the City Corporation and Crossrail Limited for the purpose of delivering a public art programme on the Elizabeth Line (central stations).

The Chair proposed that the Committee nominate Wendy Hyde, as Chair of Culture Heritage and Libraries Committee.

RESOLVED: That Wendy Hyde be appointed as Policy and Resources Committee's nominated representative to serve as a Director on the Crossrail Arts Foundation.

5. **BIDS UPDATE, FLEET STREET QUARTER MEMBER OBSERVER**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Environment providing an update on future engagement with the City BIDs including how the City Corporation would seek where compatible alignment and delivery of key strategies.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Agreed to the establishment of a City BIDs strategic partnership to be chaired by the Deputy Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee.

6. **RESPONSIBLE PROCUREMENT POLICY UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Operating Officer seeking approval to refocus the commitments in the Responsible Procurement Policy using the efficiency principles under the Target Operating Model, better aligning with strategic priorities on Climate Action and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, and the Broader ESG objectives of the City Corporation.

During the debate that followed, there was general support amongst Members for a move straight to 15% for responsible procurement weighting rather than following the two-stage approach proposed within the report and starting at 10%. Members were, however, mindful of a need to minimise immediate impacts on the supply chain and to ensure businesses were given sufficient time to change their behaviours. There was also an acknowledgement of potential disproportionate impact on SMEs through an immediate change.

A Member remarked on there being different rules within Government for dealing with SMEs and larger organisations and suggested the City Corporation could look at doing something similar. It was suggested that public procurement was about treating suppliers equally and larger organisations not being discriminated against through having to follow a different approach. The Comptroller suggested the law in this area needed to be fully understood before a final decision could be taken, with there being a procurement specialist within his department who would be able to review the proposal and confirm the legal position.

A Member referred to diversity and inclusion and of there being a need to demonstrate these within procurement processes and procedures. Members noted the Responsible Procurement Policy was supported by a wide range of corporate strategies including diversity and inclusion. The Member proposed a report come back to Policy and Resources Committee in six months' time showing how the aims and ambitions had been achieved relating to diversity and inclusion with procurement.

The Chair acknowledged the views of Members and the clear direction of travel they had expressed in wanting an immediate move to an overall weighting score of 15%, but that the impact of this on SMEs and the legal options for mitigation, needed further consideration and asked that a report come back to

Members once these had been considered and the legal position was fully understood.

A Member asked that any report back include an update on the SME Strategy.

RESOLVED: That Members agreed to defer a final decision to the next meeting when a further report on the Responsible Procurement Strategy would be provided for their consideration.

7. PROJECT GOVERNANCE

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Operating Officer outlining interim arrangements for project governance that included a temporary request for delegated authority to Tier 1 Chief Officers, to approve all reports for projects with an estimated cost of below £1m (excluding risk).

Members were mindful of a need to maintain an appropriate level of scrutiny across all projects, including those delegated to Chief Officers. It was clarified that the existing performance reporting framework would be maintained as part of any interim arrangements, with Member oversight and scrutiny continuing through the submission of reports and dashboards offering a summary of projects, with any problems or issues being brought to Members' attention as required. Members noted that a £1m delegation was already allowed for within the Scheme of Delegations and what had been proposed would bring Project Governance in line with this.

A Member, also Deputy Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee, stressed the importance of all officers having the professional capability to run a project. The Project Academy was in place to ensure officers were skilled appropriately and that they have the professional judgement required to sign off on either the initiation or advancement of a project through the gateway process. The Member referred to training modules of the Project Academy as being not too onerous and that it was therefore not unreasonable to expect officers to undertake this training as a pre-requisite before gaining the additional authority to exercise their delegations.

Members fully endorsed the need for an appropriate level of training as required. A discussion then followed on suitable time-frame to allow for completion of this. In conclusion, Members agreed to increased delegation being granted, but with this taking effect in four weeks' time to allow for relevant training modules to be completed through the Project Management Academy.

The Chamberlain referred to additional costs having to be met from policy contingency funds and of a need to go through Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, which the Chairman acknowledged.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Agreed to delegate authority for all projects with an estimated cost of below £1m (excluding risk) to Tier 1 Chief Officers and officers listed in Appendix 1 for approval; taking effect in one months' time to allow for training modules to be completed by relevant officers;

- Agreed that all Tier 1 Chief Officers and officers listed in Appendix 1 for approval are to complete relevant training modules through the Project Management Academy;
- Note that Members will be presented with a range of options for revised thresholds in July;
- Note that another report will be submitted in October to amend the Projects Procedure.

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

The Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain providing a schedule of projects and activities which have received funding from the Policy Initiatives Fund, Policy and Resources Committee's Contingency Fund, Committee's Project Reserve and COVID19 Contingency Fund for 2022/23 and future years with details of expenditure in 2022/23.

A Member, also Chair of Civic Affairs Sub-Committee, referred to the sub-committee having a number of projects within its remit where a budget would be required to allow these to progress e.g., Members' training, Members' facilities and Members' financial allowance scheme. The Member suggested a budget of up to £60,000 be allocated to Civic Affairs Sub-Committee from Policy Initiatives Fund in support its various areas of work. Members were supportive of the proposal, noting the minutes of Civic Affairs Sub-Committee and detail of any decisions taken would be presented to Policy and Resources Committee for review.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

- Note the report and contents of the schedules.
- Agree that the multiyear PIF cap be increased by £130,000 and £126,000 in 2022/23 and 2023/24 respectively to allow the previously agreed bid for the Support for Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market (IC-VCM) and UK-VCM Forum to run over multiyear.
- Agree that a budget of up to £60,000 being allocated from PIF to Civic Affairs Sub-Committee to allow for progression of a number of projects within its remit.

9. *** RECOVERY TASKFORCE - UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Town Clerk updating on implementation of the recommendations of the Recovery Taskforce report Square Mile: Future City, published in April 2021.

A Member questioned how the Recovery Taskforce was liaising with relevant Committees across the City Corporation to ensure a joined-up approach was being taken e.g., through Licensing Committee and Police Authority Board when considering the support that can be offered to licensed premises that have already been badly hit by the pandemic. It was noted that an update would come back on the specifics of activity in this area.

RECEIVED

10. *** INTERIM EVALUATION OF SQUARE SMILE CAMPAIGN**

The Committee received a joint report of the Director of Innovation and Growth and Director of Communications providing Members with headline interim results for the Square Mile marketing campaign, the core purpose of which was to encourage workers back to the City in the wake of the pandemic.

A Member suggested there was a need to understand how well the campaign had worked through data being provided. It would be good to understand how many people responded to the campaign and promoted it and to receive a breakdown of figures to understand how successful it had been.

RECEIVED

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

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

RECEIVED

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

There were no questions.

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

Constitution of Sub-Committees

The Chairman referred to a proposal of the Chair of Finance Committee seeking a change to the constitution of Policy and Resources Committee's various Sub-Committee so that appointments to these (where applicable) would be "the Finance Chair or their *permanent* nominee"

A discussion followed. There was concern expressed over the need to retain a link across both Finance Committee and Policy and Resources Committee on each of the relevant Sub-Committees. The Town Clerk referred to a similar provision already agreed and in place for Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen, who was able to put forward a nominee of their choosing on each relevant sub-committee. A Member remarked on the rationale for appointing the Chair of Finance Committee, which offered further linkage across both Finance and Policy and Resources Committees.

The Chair of Finance Committee responded and assured Members that he intended to sit on two thirds of the Sub-Committees, but that he wanted the option of flexibility with some of his appointments.

The Chairman concluded the discussion and suggested the proposal be supported, with there being an opportunity to consider and review this further as part of the light touch review of implementation of the Governance Review implementation. The Chairman added how he was sure the Chair of Finance had listened to the points made regarding retaining a link to Finance and Policy

and Resources Committee and that he would no doubt consider all appointments with care.

RESOLVED: That Members:

- Agree to change to the constitution of its sub-committees (where applicable) to “the Finance Chairman or their *permanent* nominee”

14. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

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

Part 2 – Non-Public Agenda

15. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

- a) The non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 5th May 2022 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

HM Queen’s Platinum Jubilee

A Member asked that his congratulations be conveyed to the Remembrancer’s Department for all their work over the weekend in support of Her Majesty the Queen’s Platinum Jubilee, with this receiving the endorsement of all Members.

A Member, also Chair of Civic Affairs Sub-Committee, confirmed they had written to the Remembrancer expressing their thanks, not just to the Remembrancer’s Department, but all officers across the City Corporation for their efforts and the important role everyone played in ensuring a success of the occasion. The Chairman asked that the Committee’s thanks be recorded.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no urgent items of business.

Part 3 - Confidential Agenda

18. MINUTES

- a) The confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 17th March 2022 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

- b) The confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 5th May 2022 were agreed as an accurate record of the meeting.

19. MARKETS CO-LOCATION PROGRAMME - UPDATE AND ADDITIONAL BUDGET REQUEST

The Committee considered a joint report of the City Surveyor, Chief Operating Officer, Markets Director and Chamberlain relating to the Markets Co-location Programme – Update and additional budget request.

The meeting ended at 3.31pm

Chairman

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

Committee	Date
Policy and Resources Committee	7 July 2022
Subject: Lead Members (Policy Areas)	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1 - 12
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: Town Clerk	For Decision
Report author: Greg Moore	

Summary

One of the outcomes of the recent Governance Review process was endorsement for the principle of a greater use of Lead Members (or 'rapporteurs') on the Policy & Resources Committee in particular. This was intended to help spread the burden of office placed upon the Chairman amongst the wider committee (particularly in the context of the then-intended transition from three to one Deputy Chairs), whilst also making best use of talent available on the Committee. The creation of Lead Member portfolios would also give a wider array of Members the opportunity to develop in-depth knowledge of certain areas and prepare them for, potentially, standing as Chair of the Committee in due course.

Further, the Lead Member roles would allow for greater corporate endeavour, as more Members would be involved more closely in key areas of the Corporation's strategic direction and work in greater concert with officers as the organisation strives to deliver its policy goals with greater efficacy.

This report sets out a generic job description for the proposed Policy Lead roles (Appendix 1) and identifies those initial areas where it is suggested that Policy Leads should be appointed, namely, Climate Action, Emerging Markets, Advanced Markets, Sustainability, Innovation in Technology, and SMEs.

Should Members support the proposal and indicative job description, then expressions of interests will be sought and presented for appointment at the next meeting.

Recommendation

The Policy & Resources Committee is recommended to:

1. Endorse the creation of Policy Lead Roles for the areas set out in paragraph 10.
2. Approve the proposed job description for Policy Leads set out at Appendix 1 and draft eligibility criteria for appointment at Appendix 2.
3. Approve the appointments process set out in paragraph 20.

Main Report

Background

1. During 2020, a comprehensive Governance Review of the City Corporation was undertaken by Robert Rodgers, The Lord Lisvane. His proposals were subsequently reviewed and debated by Members through a detailed engagement process, culminating in a set of final decisions being taken in December 2021.
2. One of the recommendations made by Lord Lisvane, and endorsed by the Court of Common Council, was the use of Members in a “rapporteur” role.
3. This proposal was made in the context of the considerable workload that will continue to fall upon Chairs of Committees, with the suggestion being that a number of general Committee Members be asked to take the lead on particular subjects within a Committee’s area of responsibility. It was noted that this happened to some extent already but, in the context of smaller Committees, might benefit from being used more extensively.
4. Members were supportive of this proposal with particular respect to the Policy and Resources Committee, with it observed that this was a constructive mechanism to not only help “share the burden” of the workload (particularly given the move to one Deputy Chairman, away from the three previously utilised), but also in affording the opportunity to utilise the diverse talents and expertise of different Members in a more effective way.
5. One particular example has been the role played by Deputy Keith Bottomley in respect of the Climate Action Strategy where, at the behest of the Committee, he has acted to assist officers in realising the Committee’s ambitions in respect of the Strategy’s design, implementation, and monitoring, whilst not becoming involved at the operational level and respecting the “executive” boundaries inherent in the Member / Officer relationship.

Current Position and Proposal: Policy Lead Roles

6. While the Court subsequently determined to retain the practice of having three Deputy / Vice Chairs for the Policy & Resources Committee, there remained firm support for the principle of employing the “Lead Member” proposal, given the significant responsibilities of the Committee and the growing expectations and time demands on the Chairman and his Deputies, who (as unremunerated volunteers) might not always be available to offer the informal guidance and expertise that technical officers might seek when developing certain proposals.
7. It is also recognised that the considerable experience and diverse skill-sets of all Members could be employed to much greater effect in order to sharpen the City Corporation’s focus or delivery in certain areas, with this proposal providing one mechanism to allow for this to be achieved.
8. Further, the creation of Lead Member portfolios will also give a wider array of Members the opportunity to develop in-depth knowledge of certain areas and prepare them for, potentially, standing as Chair of the Committee in due course.

9. Clearly, the nature and number of Lead Members (and associated remits) will fluctuate over time, as learning emerges from implementation and particular corporate or strategic goals / activities evolve.
10. However, having considered the current area of focus of the Committee and their own respective portfolios, the Chairman, in consultation with the Deputy and Vice Chairmen, would propose that Lead Members be appointed for the following policy areas in the first instance:
 - **Sustainability** – the extremely important area of Climate Action acted as a forerunner of the Policy Lead role, with Deputy Keith Bottomley appointed by the Committee to act on its behalf in supporting officers in the design, delivery, and monitoring of its Climate Action Strategy. This significant piece of activity remains a cornerstone of the Committee and Corporation's policy agenda and it is, therefore, important that appropriate focus be retained. However, as the Strategy becomes embedded as a key cross-cutting area of activity, it is perhaps now time to look to broaden out the Policy Lead role such that it focuses on the matter of sustainability across the Corporation more generally (whilst still incorporating the Climate Action piece). This would incorporate a focus on sustainability within the Financial and Professional Services sector, where ESG has quickly become a fundamental part of how businesses conduct their activity and where the Corporation can add significant value in supporting firms in the City and beyond in meeting their Net Zero targets.
 - **Emerging or 'High Growth' Markets** – the operating model of this Committee's competitiveness strategy outlines a repeatable approach to target intelligently its activities in engaging with markets which represent future business with the UK.
 - **Advanced Markets** – equally, the Committee must maintain focus on those markets where current market activity is highest in support of the promotion of the City as the best place to invest and do business.
 - **Innovation in Technology** – the growth of the tech sector and the many innovations being delivered to the FPS sector through digital technology mean that this is an area of inescapable focus for the City and the Corporation.
 - **SMEs** – small and medium enterprises are an integral and growing part of the City's ecosystem and an area where the City's support has, historically, been under-developed. A new SME Strategy is being developed to re-energise, draw together, and strengthen the City's offering in this area, and the appointment of a Policy Lead in support of the delivery of this Strategy is expected to provide similar benefits to those achieved through the Climate Action role (which was similarly cross-cutting in nature).
11. As with all Member roles, there can be no legal executive or decision-making power vested in these posts, nor would the removal of responsibility from the Committee be appropriate in any event.
12. Rather, the roles are intended to act in a more advisory and facilitative capacity, strengthening the collaborative approach between Members and Officers at an

early stage as well as during the delivery phase, so as to provide for greater advice, guidance and scrutiny in between meetings.

13. Lead Members would act as a “sounding board” for relevant officers, to expedite and strengthen proposals coming to Committee; they would also act as a champion of the policy area amongst fellow Members and (where appropriate) externally. This might involve communicating or clarifying policies and implications to colleagues, facilitating greater corporate awareness of activities; or helping to identify and resolve issues or queries in a timely fashion in advance of meetings (thereby minimising delay or confusion in implementation), amongst other things.
14. They would also be expected to report to the Chairman regularly, ensuring he and the wider leadership team are kept apprised of developments and progress and that their wider political steer can be communicated back to officers, as well as to test and ensure coherency with wider policy positions and activities.
15. There would be an expectation that each Lead Member would update the Committee regularly, certainly on no less than an annual basis, on their activities and delivery.
16. Lead Members would also be expected to operate within the normal confines of the Member / Officer relationship and work closely with relevant technical officers to ensure consistency of approach and corporate endeavour. For instance, the utilisation of briefings provided by technical officers for meetings, using appropriate officer channels to arrange meetings and follow-ups, ensuring agreed actions are recorded in writing, and so on. This will be essential in ensuring that activity, communication and messaging can be managed and co-ordinated effectively and efficiently.
17. A proposed high-level job description, articulating the nature of the role, is set out at Appendix 1.

Appointment Process

18. Should Members be supportive of the creation of these positions, expressions of interest would be sought, with the Committee asked to make appointments at its September meeting.
19. Given the range of skills and expertise across the wider Court, and in the interest of leveraging this for the maximum benefit of the Corporation, it is recommended that the Policy Lead posts be open to the full membership of the Court and advertised to all Members accordingly. This would also have the benefit of involving a wider pool of Members in the day-to-day work of the Committee.
20. It is suggested that the process used for appointments to the Competitiveness Advisory Board be adopted; i.e.:-
 - the roles are advertised to the Court with specific criteria for each Lead area set out;

- those wishing to apply are asked to submit expressions of interest, setting out relevant experience / skills against the relevant criteria;
- applications are reviewed by an assessment panel (comprised of the Chairman, Deputy Chairman, and Vice Chairs) supported with advice from technical officers, to identify a shortlist and optimal candidate;
- the panel's recommendations for the roles are submitted to the Committee for consideration and appointment.

21. Draft criteria for each of the Policy Lead areas are set out in Appendix 2.

Corporate and Strategic Implications

22. *Financial and Resource implications* – There would be no direct financial or resource implications associated with the adoption of these posts.

Climate Implications – The proposals included in this paper would support the delivery of the Climate Action and Sustainability programme through additional strategic support and focus helping to drive positive outcomes.

Equalities implications – Under the Equality Act 2010, all public bodies have a duty to ensure that when exercising their functions they have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and to take steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people and encourage people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately low. The proposals contained in this report do not have any potential negative impact on a particular group of people based on their protected characteristics.

Risk implications – There is always an inherent risk that, despite the individual Lead Member's best intentions, their interpretation of the Committee's wishes might not reflect accurately the majority view. However, the absence of any executive decision-making powers and the requirement for any and all Member decisions to continue to come to Committee in the usual way will mitigate against this risk and provide no greater risk than officers operating with lesser Member guidance or advice.

Security implications – none.

Conclusion

23. The creation of Lead Member roles was supported as an outcome of the Governance Review and this report proposes a number of roles for appointment to. The roles are intended to enhance not only the efficacy of the Committee by utilising Members' skills and time more effectively, but also provide for greater corporate endeavour and development opportunities amongst the membership. The roles will be subject to annual review and re-appointment, but in-year changes can also be made to allow for as much flexibility and pragmatism as required.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Draft Job Description
- Appendix 2 – Draft Eligibility Criteria for Policy Leads

Policy Leads - Job Description

Appointment

- Appointed annually by the Committee from amongst the membership of a full Court. Appointments shall be considered on the basis of recommendations from a selection panel, which will review expressions of interest from the Court against specified criteria.

Overall Responsibilities

- To act as a senior spokesperson for, and represent the views of, the Committee in respect of the relevant policy area for which they have been appointed Lead.

Main Tasks and Responsibilities

- To support the Chairman in the formation and delivery of the Committee and Corporation's policy goals (within the relevant policy area).
- To deputise for the Chairman at relevant engagements or hospitality events (in the absence of the Deputy / Vice Chairmen).
- To act as spokesman on behalf of the Chairman in their absence (and the absence of the Deputy / Vice Chairmen).
- To act as a point of contact or "sounding board" for relevant officers, providing political steers in relaying the Committee's views, so as to inform implementation and prioritisation at the operational level.
- To act as the Member point of contact for colleagues interested in the policy area, assisting with information sharing and triaging of questions to relevant technical officers.
- To support and co-ordinate political decision making between and for relevant Committee Chairs.
- To lead on the collation of insight and expertise from Members across the wider Court with relevant knowledge or experience of the policy area.
- To work with colleagues outside of the formal meeting setting to share information / understanding, enabling Members to coalesce around the agreed policy decisions and implementation plans.

NB - these posts have no decision-making responsibility or powers and are purely advisory; post holders are expected to operate within the boundaries of the Member / Officer Protocol at all times and not be unduly involved in the operational aspects or delivery of the policy areas.

Policy Areas: Draft Eligibility Requirements / Criteria

Policy Area	Eligibility Requirements / Criteria
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in Sustainability within Financial or Professional Services and/or Communications • Committee experience in Port Health, Planning and Transport, Financial Investment Board, Open Spaces or PIB / or OPPSC • Understanding of Sustainable Finance or Infrastructure with or in COLC target markets of US/Canada, Europe, China or Japan
SMEs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in working in or with SMEs, investing in SMEs and/or Communications
Emerging/ High Growth Markets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in working in Financial and Professional Services in any emerging or high growth market
Innovation in Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in working in Innovation in Financial and Professional Services and/or as an investor in any Tech sector
Advanced Markets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior experience of working in Financial and Professional services with or in COLC target markets of US/Canada, Europe, China or Japan

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Policy and Resources Committee – For decision	Dated: 07/07/2022
Subject: Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund – Approval of policy changes	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 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: Managing Director of the Bridge House Estate and Chief Charities Officer	For Decision
Report author: James Lee, Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Programme Manager	

Summary

The City Corporation adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in 2014. National CIL Regulations require that 15% of CIL receipts be reserved for neighbourhood funding. Local authorities are required to engage with communities on how this neighbourhood funding should be used to support development of the area. Local authorities are required to report annually on the collection and use of CIL funds, identifying separately the amount of funds allocated to neighbourhood funding.

An amended policy for the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF) was agreed by this committee in May 2019, with agreement that funding applications for under £25,000 are to be determined by City Corporation officers under delegated authority and funding applications for between £25,000 and £50,000 are to be determined by City Corporation officers under delegated authority in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee. The Resource Allocation Sub-Committee are to determine applications for funding in excess of £50,000.

The CILNF application process is managed by the City Corporation's Central Grants Unit, with officers assessing applications and providing support to Committee in the consideration of larger applications. The administrative cost incurred in operating the Fund is recoverable from the 5% of City CIL funds allowed to cover such costs in Regulations.

Members are asked to approve the policy changes supported by feedback from a public consultation carried out in May 2022. Members are asked to note the performance of the CILNF to date.

Recommendation

Members are recommended to:

1. Note the response to the consultation on the CILNF (**Appendix 1**).
2. Note the grants awarded to date (**Appendix 2**) and current position of the CILNF.
3. Approve the two publicly supported proposed changes to the CILNF, set out in the proposal of this paper.
 - a. To amend the funding limit on any one project from 15% of total available funds at the time to a new upper limit £500k, with authority for the City Corporation's Resource Allocation Sub-Committee to exceed this limit for applications that demonstrate exceptional community benefit.
 - b. To clarify that organisations are permitted to reapply to the CILNF following previous successful applications.

Main Report

Background

1. Under the 2008 Planning Act and the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended), a local authority may adopt a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) setting out how it will require contributions from development towards the cost of providing new infrastructure. Historically a local authority adopting a CIL set out the infrastructure it will fund through the CIL in a document known as a Regulation 123 List and the City Corporation previously adopted such a list. Whilst Regulation 123 Lists will be replaced with Infrastructure Lists in the future, the adopted Regulation 123 List still reflects the infrastructure that the City Corporation intends to wholly or partly fund through CIL.
2. CIL regulations allow for up to 5% of CIL receipts to be used to fund the administrative costs incurred in operating a CIL. Regulations also require that 15% of CIL receipts shall be reserved for neighbourhood funding, or 25% where there is a neighbourhood plan. Neighbourhood funding must be passed to a neighbourhood forum, parish or town council, where they exist. Where they do not exist (as in the City of London), the local authority will retain CIL neighbourhood funds but should engage with communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend this element of CIL.
3. In accordance with national Planning Practice Guidance, local authorities should set out clearly and transparently how they will engage with communities and the use of the neighbourhood fund should match the priorities expressed by these local communities.

4. Regulations require that the neighbourhood fund must be used to support the development of the local council's area, or any part of that area. CIL Regulation 59F allows a wider scope of projects to be funded through the CILNF than that allowed for other CIL funding, including:
 - a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; (the same criteria as for other CIL funds) or
 - b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area (additional flexibility for neighbourhood fund).

In delivering against (b) above, the neighbourhood fund does not have to be spent in accordance with the local authority's CIL spending priorities (set out in its Regulation 123 List).

5. Local authorities are required to report annually on the collection and use of CIL funds, identifying separately the amount of CIL Neighbourhood Funds and how they have been used.
6. Management of the CILNF process is aligned with the City's existing grant allocation process, through the CGU. A full policy document can be found at Appendix 3.
7. The CGU is co-located with the City Bridge Trust (CBT) team in order to facilitate consistency of approach and harmonise service standards across grant-making activities by the City Corporation (in its various capacities, including as Trustee of a number of charities which make grants as well as delivery of the Central Grant Programme). The Managing Director of Bridge House Estate and Chief Charities Officer is responsible for maintaining an overview of the CGU (and broader charity matters), with relevant input from the BHE & Charities Finance Team, with the work being delivered by the Head of CGU.
8. Where an application will have an impact on a specific ward, your Officers will consult with Members of that ward as part of the assessment process.

Current Position

9. The CILNF launched on 1 September 2020. In June 2022, the neighbourhood portion of the City CIL stood at £5,205,356.

Amount held as at 01/09/2020	£6,222,994
Further amounts added to fund	£2,428,887
Funds committed	£3,446,526
Balance remaining as at 01/05/2022	£5,205,356

10. Since the launch of the CILNF, Members and Officers have worked together to commit £3,446,526 in funding to City communities.

Financial year	Funds committed
2020/21	£544,327
2021/22	£2,050,344
2022/23	£851,855 ¹

11. At present, the CILNF is temporarily paused to new applications in excess of £50,000 in order to carry out its statutory reporting and public consultation obligations.
12. The CILNF is currently processing an application pipeline of £2,147,335. It is not anticipated that this entire pipeline will be fully funded.
13. The CILNF application process is managed by the City Corporation's CGU, with officers assessing applications and providing support in the process of decision making by drawing on knowledge from across the Corporation and City communities to ensure that the CILNF is funding work that meets community priorities. Applications for £50,000 or less are assessed by the CGU who draw on local knowledge and a wider knowledge of the sector. The CGU's resulting recommendation is then considered by the CILNF Officer Panel which is composed of senior officers representing different departments of the Corporation. Where an application has an impact on a specific ward, members of that ward are consulted in advance of the deliberations of officers. Delegated authority allows for decisions on funding for £25,000 or less to be made by the Town Clerk in consultation with the CILNF Officer panel, decisions on funding for £25,001 up to £50,000 are made by the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Resource Allocations Sub-Committee.
14. Applications in excess of £50,000 go through a similar process, albeit with added scrutiny given the sums of money being applied for. In addition to the financial assessment of the CGU, the BHE & Charities Finance Team will complete a financial due diligence review before signing off the recommendation made by officers in the CGU. The application must then pass through the scrutiny of both the CILNF Officer Panel and relevant individual ward members before being referred to the Resource Allocations Sub-Committee which holds the ultimate decision-making power in this process.
15. Feedback from the public consultation noted an overall satisfaction with the design and delivery of the CILNF. The combined input of officers, members and wider city communities are perceived to be helping the CILNF to make good decisions on the allocation of CILNF.
16. The CILNF has two current policy positions that should be noted by members as they relate to the proposal within this paper. The first of these policy positions is the normal upper limit on funds for any one project of 15% of total funds available through the CILNF at the time of application. The second is that the Corporation's published CILNF policy is unclear as to whether organisations can reapply for funding at the end of their grant.

¹ A portion of this sum has been agreed in principle but is pending final confirmation by RASC.

Proposal

17. Public consultation on the CILNF took place in May 2022. Responses were received from 32 organisations and individuals; whilst limited, this is nearly double the number of responses that the original consultation on the establishment of the CILNF received (17). These comments variously supported the current operation of the CILNF, suggested areas of priority for the distribution of funds, and overwhelmingly agreed with the proposed amendments to the design and operation of the Fund.
18. Two key changes are proposed to the CILNF in response to the comments. The first of these changes is to revise the normal upper limit on funds for any one project from 15% of available funds at the time of application to a fixed figure of £500,000 with authority for the City Corporation's Resource Allocation Sub-Committee to exceed this limit for applications that demonstrate exceptional community benefit. This proposal was supported by 92% of the responses to the public consultation.
19. The second proposed change would make it clear that the CILNF will allow organisations to reapply for funding at the end of a grant: there are a limited number of organisations who are working in the Square Mile and allowing organisations to reapply to the CILNF will maximise the range of opportunities for potential support for the City's communities. Any organisation seeking to reapply to the CILNF will have to demonstrate a successful track record of delivering positive outcomes for City communities in their previously funded work. The CIL Neighbourhood Fund will need to balance a portfolio of existing organisations and new applicants to the CIL Neighbourhood Fund to ensure that the funds available are not concentrated in a small number of returning organisations. This proposal was supported by 90% of the responses to the public consultation.
20. Subject to the approval of members regarding the proposed changes to CILNF policy, the CILNF will immediately re-open to large applications (over £50,000).

Corporate & Strategic Implications

21. Corporate Plan Implications: the CILNF can resource community-led infrastructure improvements across the City and contribute towards meeting the 3 aims of the Corporate Plan 2018-23, particularly Contribute to a Flourishing Society and Shaping an Outstanding Environment.
22. Security Implications: the CILNF fulfils a statutory requirement for the spending of CIL. There are no direct security implications, though future funded projects may bring security benefits.
23. Financial Implications: the CILNF makes use of that proportion of City CIL monies which are required by statute to be used to assist in the delivery of new infrastructure to meet community needs (15% of CIL funds). The costs of management of the grant application process will be met through the 5% of CIL funds set aside by statute to cover CIL administration.

24. Equalities and resourcing implications: the CILNF has been subject to an Equality Analysis Test of Relevance. This has concluded that there are no impacts arising from these proposals for protected groups and that a full Equality Analysis is not required.
25. Volunteering programme: Projects funded by the CILNF may provide volunteering opportunities which can be offered to Officers via the Corporate Volunteering programme if and when appropriate.
26. Delivery of the Fund will be through existing staff resources in Departments. Staff resource requirements will be met through allocation of some of the City CIL funds set aside by statute to cover administration costs.

Conclusion

27. Since its launch in September 2020, the CILNF has committed £3,446,526 in support of City Communities. The CILNF funds a diverse portfolio of activities that includes support for some of the City's most important heritage spaces whilst also improving the health & wellbeing of City communities.
28. This report summarises the recent public consultation on how the CILNF is operating and proposes two amendments to CILNF policy to be agreed by this committee.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Consultation Key Themes 2022-07-07
Appendix 2 – Applications approved to date 2020-07-07
Appendix 3 – CILNF Policy

Background Papers

Report to Policy & Resources Committee 02/05/2019: City of London Community Infrastructure Levy – Approval of Neighbourhood Fund

James Lee

Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Programme Manager
E: james.lee@cityoflondon.gov.uk

City of London Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund

Key Themes arising from public consultation May 2022

Information about the Consultation

This consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF) was sent to stakeholders across the City by the Department of the Built Environment, the Department of Community and Children's Services and the Central Grants Unit. This consultation received nearly twice as many responses (32) as the original consultation (17) conducted during the setup of the CILNF in 2019.

Over a third of responses came from residents of the City, with responses from businesses and community organisation constituting the rest of the responses.

There were two key proposals in this consultation: a proposal to revise the normal upper limit on funds for any one project from a percentage amount to a fixed figure and a proposal to allow organisations to reapply for funding at the end of a grant. Of the responses received regarding these two proposals, respondents were overwhelmingly in favour of both changes being proposed (92% and 90% respectively).

Question 1: Please tell us about some of the challenges your community

faces. *We ask this question to better understand the needs of the City of London's communities. You could tell us about a ward-specific issue or a wider issue. It can be a big or small issue that has an impact on many people or just a few.*

Three broad themes emerged from the responses to this question: concern for the environment, a desire to see greater provision of activities for families (especially those on lower incomes) and a need to improve the accessibility of the City for disabled and older people.

Responses to this question included:

- *"Cleaner air; more green spaces are needed. For the wider City I believe that more needs to be done to bring in more people into the City to understand how it works and that the City is open to all"*
- *"Adapting our infrastructure to create a better space for the wider community, with improved disabled access."*
- *"People often have the impression that the City is wealthy and it can be difficult to attract funding for community projects but this is not the reality. It is good that this fund exists, my children have been to some activities supported by this fund." (sic)*

Question 2: Please tell us about the priorities you think the CILNF should have when distributing funding. *Since its launch in September 2020, the CILNF has funded a wide range of work across health & wellbeing, arts & culture, sustainability, restoration and regeneration. The CILNF is deliberately wide in the scope of what it can fund, so that local communities can determine their own priorities and how the CILNF should be used.*

A wide range of spending priorities were suggested, many of which are eligible for support through the CILNF. Others were more relevant to Departmental responsibilities and not eligible for funding through CIL. Respondents highlighted the need for the Fund to be flexible to respond to community needs. The priorities suggested by respondents included:

- Crime prevention
- Dealing with homelessness
- Street cleansing
- Public transport services
- Community facilities (including halls and meeting places)
- Green spaces
- Heritage assets
- Air quality
- Public realm improvements, including improved biodiversity
- Tackling food poverty
- Improvements to retail centres and streets
- Improving the City's cultural offer

Question 3: Is there anything else you would like to tell us about how you think the CILNF should be used?

A number of responses cited a lack of awareness amongst City communities of the support available through the CILNF. It became clear from a number of responses that there is a need for the City to be doing more to promote the CILNF.

Other comments indicated a general satisfaction with the CILNF processes that have been implemented and an encouragement to use the CILNF beyond the geographic boundaries of the Square Mile to support other spaces owned and managed by the City of London Corporation,

- *“Odd that this is the first that I have heard about CILNF. As a small business in the City, and a resident, I'm surprised.”*
- *“The City of London Corporation has many lovely green spaces outside the Square Mile, such as Hampstead Heath, Coulsdon Common, and Riddlesdown. It would be great if projects on these green spaces would be eligible for CILNF funding too. Thank you for your consideration!”*
- *“I think your application processes are good and robust.”*

Question 4: Should the maximum grant amount be a fixed figure instead of a percentage? *Currently, the maximum value of a grant that an organisation can apply for is 15% of the total CILNF funds available. We have noted that this is both unwieldy and unfair for applicants: applications which come later in the year are disadvantaged by the continual spending of the CILNF over the course of time. It is proposed that the maximum grant amount is revised to be £500,000 with authority for the City Corporation's Resource Allocation Sub-Committee to exceed this limit for applications that demonstrate exceptional community benefit.*

The proposal within this question received great support, with 92% of respondents expressing a favourable view towards this change. As part of the ongoing management of the CILNF, the Central Grants Unit has closely monitored the pipeline of applications received and worked with applicants to drive value for money against the funding being sought. To date, the CILNF has only received two applications for funds in excess of £500,000.

Responses to this question included:

- *“Agree that the fund needs to work fairly over the year and so a fixed figure would be fairer”*
- *“I think this is a very good approach, providing discretion.”*
- *“Yes. This is also because organisations applying are often unsure of what the total of amount of CILNF funds available.”*

Question 5: Currently, the CILNF will not fund an organisation more than once, should this rule be changed? *Given the small size of the Square Mile, we believe there is a case to be made for allowing organisations to reapply for funding at the end of a grant: there are a limited number of organisations who are working in the Square Mile and allowing organisations to reapply to the CILNF will enable their continued support for the City's communities.*

This question saw 90% of respondents express a view in favour of changing the rule on reapplication to allow organisations to seek repeat funding from the CILNF.

Any organisation seeking to reapply to the CILNF will, of course, have to demonstrate a successful track record of delivering positive outcomes for City communities in their previously funded work. There will also be a need longer-term to balance a portfolio of existing organisations against new applicants to the CILNF.

Responses to this question included:

- *“Yes. This is particularly essential for projects or events, which are not once-off activities. It would ensure continuity and sustained support. Otherwise, beneficiaries and participants might feel left out suddenly when a programme ends, without an alternative to meet their needs.”*

- *“Yes. There is a strong need to allow re-applications, to support and strengthen organisations building roots and a legacy in the area, and to allow further investment in work with proven track-record and/or insightful evaluation.”*
- *“I agree with this case, subject to evaluation of the use made of the previous grant.”*

Question 6: Is there anything else that you would like the CILNF to keep or change about the way it operates?

The responses to this question broadly fell into two categories: a desire for greater awareness of the CILNF and satisfaction with the current operation of the CILNF. There is certainly more that the City could be doing to encourage applications to the CILNF from City communities, in particular by doing more to involve residents.

Responses to this question included:

- *“Publicity for successful projects could be improved.”*
- *“Make it more accessible to residents. What would be really good is a YouTube video on CILNF and how residents can get involved. YouTube Is becoming the best way to communicate complex issues to many of them.”*
- *“Not at this time. It looks like your application process is straightforward.”*
- *“The application process was very smooth, we have felt well supported by our Grants Officer and the monitoring is not excessive, so all of these things would ideally stay the same.”*

Appendix 2 – Applications approved to date (07.07.2022)

Financial Year 2020/21

Applicant	Total awarded (£)	Details of proposal
Becket Pageant for London (18026)	£24,500	To fund the community outreach and engagement elements associated with the Beckett Pageant for London including the schools programme.
Maggie Keswick Jencks Cancer Caring Centres Trust (17995)	£254,827	Awarded over five years towards the salary of a Cancer Support Specialist and creation of a therapeutic garden at Barts Hospital.
St Vedast-alias-Foster (18459)	£25,000	Awarded over one year to make the churchyard of St Mary Staining at the corner of Oat Lane fully accessible by replacing the steep steps with a graduated incline.
Bevis Marks Synagogue Heritage Foundation (18025)	£240,000	Awarded over four years towards the salary of a Community Officer, a programme of community outreach and the cost of restorative work and access improvements.
SUBTOTAL 2020/21	£544,327	

Financial Year 2021/22

Applicant	Total awarded (£)	Details of proposal
Fleet Street Sundial CIC (18616)	£31,250	Awarded over five years to create the Fleet Street Sundial Artwork with its associated information plaques and to upgrade the website and provide ongoing maintenance.
Age UK City of London (18506)	£48,171	Awarded over two years towards the salary and associated costs of a Coordinator role, plus the costs of delivering a range of activities.
Globe Studios Limited (18558)	£198,633	Awarded over two years to develop a creative studio and architecture/design library alongside a regular schedule of public, private and corporate creative classes.
Barbican Centre Trust Limited (18557)	£191,067	Awarded over 12 months to deliver a Creative Communities programme, collaborating with partners across the City to strengthen connections with and between neighbours and the culture on their doorstep.
Repowering Limited (18838)	£33,660	Awarded over two years to support the capital costs for a 50kWp solar array to be installed on the Middlesex Street Estate and towards a two-year Community Champion role.
Learning Through The Arts (18614)	£49,984	Awarded over two years to provide a series of children and family workshops for residents using multiple art forms from African drumming to Storytelling during the school breaks and holidays.
City Property Association Limited (18847)	£100,000	Awarded over two years (£50,000; £50,000) to support the One City project, the City of London's digital community.
Parochial Church Council of the Ecclesiastical Parish of St Mary-le-Bow, Cheapside (18880)	£18,274	For the modernisation and adaptation of the sound panels and sound control doors to improve sound control and safety of the Bow Bells.

Golden Lane Estate Residents' Association (18863)	£50,000	To improve cycle parking and accessibility for residents and visitors on the Golden Lane estate.
Barbican Centre Trust Limited (18919)	£39,663	Funding towards the cost of increasing project delivery for the Creative Communities programme within its first year.
New Diorama (18871)	£154,640	Awarded over nine months towards salary, operational and related project costs at the NDT Broadgate creative hub.
The World Reimagined Limited (18837)	£100,000	To fund the World Reimagined Sculpture Trail in May 2022.
Temple Bar Trust (18843)	£250,000	Awarded over five years to provide an educational programme for the local community, children and visitors, based in the refurbished Temple Bar and adjoining accommodation in Paternoster Lodge.
Royal Society for Blind Children (18949)	£48,464	Awarded over one year towards the costs of the first year's operating costs of the Life without Limits Centre.
Pollinating London Together (18909)	£230,000	Awarded over two years towards the post of a full-time Ecologist/Project Manager, administrative support, and related project costs.
Outset Contemporary Art Fund (18864)	£110,932	Awarded over one year to support a delivery partnership securing long-term creative infrastructure, and rapid activation using short-term projects, to achieve "Fuelling Creative Renewal" and "Culture/Commerce Taskforce" strategic aims.
Historic Royal Palaces (18896)	£300,000	Awarded over one year for the hard-landscaping and infrastructure that will enable the Platinum Jubilee 'Superbloom' celebration.

The Worshipful Company of Chartered Architects (18855)	£24,600	Awarded over one year to increase public and professional awareness of sustainability issues by supporting the initial phase of a competition for a 21st century EcoHome design to be constructed for temporary public exhibition in Paternoster Square.
Curving Road (18948)	£24,000	To support two weekend festivals of performances and exhibitions featuring 20 artists from the Square Mile and beyond.
XLP (18986)	£46,824	Awarded over three years to support the 'Ready to Work' programme which equips young people who are not in employment, education or training (NEET) to be work ready and to remain in employment.
SUBTOTAL 2021/22	£2,050,344	

Financial Year 2022/23

Applications approved – total value: £TBD

Applicant	Total awarded (£)	Details of proposal
Barts Heritage	£435,500	To support the comprehensive activities programme at Barts Heritage, providing facilities for community use in education, recreation and health and wellbeing.
The Temple Church	£408,500	Funding towards a capital Restoration and Renew project to transform the modern 'envelope' around the Church's historic core: all the front-of-house and back-of-house facilities will be re-configured and modernised.
St. Michael Cornhill (ref. 18942)	£7,855	For the improvement of St. Michael's garden as a public amenity providing a quiet, attractive oasis in the City
SUBTOTAL 2022/23 YTD	£889,355	

City of London

Community Infrastructure Levy

Neighbourhood Fund



City of London Community Infrastructure Levy

Neighbourhood Fund

Introduction and legislative background

1. The Community Infrastructure Levy is a charge levied on new development, introduced by the Planning Act 2008. It is intended to help local authorities deliver the infrastructure needed to support development. The power to set a charge came into effect from April 2010, through the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, which have subsequently been amended.
2. The City of London Corporation implemented a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for the City of London from 1 July 2014.
3. Further information on the City CIL is available on the City Corporation's website at: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>

CIL Neighbourhood Fund Requirements

4. Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations require that 15% of CIL receipts should be reserved to enable the delivery of neighbourhood priorities. These receipts should be passed directly to existing parish and town councils where development has taken place. Where a neighbourhood plan or neighbourhood development order has been made 25% of CIL receipts from development in the plan area is reserved for the delivery of neighbourhood priorities.
5. Where there is no existing parish, town or community council, neighbourhood plan or development order, then the local authority will retain neighbourhood CIL funds, but should engage with communities where development has taken place and agree with them how best to spend the neighbourhood CIL.
6. Within the City of London, there are no existing parish, town or community councils and no adopted neighbourhood plans or neighbourhood development orders. The City Corporation therefore retains the CIL Neighbourhood Fund and should seek community views on how this Fund should be used. In exercising this role, the City Corporation has considered whether specific communities or

neighbourhoods should be identified. However, given that the City is little over one square mile in area, the City Corporation considers that it should be regarded as a single neighbourhood for the purposes of collection and spending of CIL Neighbourhood Funds.

What can CIL Neighbourhood Funds be used for?

7. CIL Regulation 59(F) requires that the Neighbourhood Fund be used to support the development of the neighbourhood. The scope of projects that can be funded by the Neighbourhood Fund is wider than that for general CIL funds and comprises:
 - a. The provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or
 - b. Anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.
8. This definition is deliberately wide and allows the City Corporation to work collaboratively with local communities to determine priorities and how the Fund should be used.

Scale of the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund

9. The City of London CIL was implemented from 1 July 2014.
10. At July 2022, the total amount of CIL monies available through the CIL Neighbourhood Fund was £5.8 million.

Community Priorities

11. The City Corporation has adopted a Regulation 123 List which identifies the types of infrastructure that it will consider funding using the Community Infrastructure Levy. This Regulation 123 List is kept under review and any proposals for change will be subject to public consultation. The current Regulation 123 List is available on the City Corporation's website at:
<https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx> . The Regulation 123 List is used principally to guide the use of CIL monies outside of the Neighbourhood Fund.
12. In considering how to use the CIL Neighbourhood Fund, Planning Practice Guidance states that where there is no parish, town or community

council, charging authorities should engage with communities where development has taken place on their priorities for funding.

13. The City Corporation consulted on priorities for the use of the City's CIL Neighbourhood Fund during May 2022. This consultation revealed support for the Fund to be used primarily to deliver infrastructure and services that meet local community identified needs.

14. The City's Neighbourhood Fund has been established to be applied to funding applications from local communities and community groups and to deliver improvements in infrastructure which have the potential to deliver benefit to City residents, workers and visitors. The Fund could be used for:

- Smaller scale projects, deliverable for under £50,000, in response to locally identified needs.
- Larger projects of over £50,000 and normally less than £500,000.

Community Definition

15. The City of London has a resident population of approximately 8,000 and a daily working population of over 500,000 occupying nearly 9 million square metres of office floorspace. The City Corporation's Statement of Community Involvement already recognises that it is not appropriate to regard the 'local community' as just the resident community. For the purposes of the CIL Neighbourhood Fund, 'community' is defined as local residents, City workers and the owners and occupiers of City buildings.

Governance Process

16. The City CIL Neighbourhood Fund will be allocated following consideration of valid applications (i.e. those that meet the adopted assessment criteria for the Neighbourhood Fund) from communities within the City of London or close to the City of London where projects support the development of the City. The determination of these applications will rest with the City Corporation. The City Corporation will publish details of funded applications on the City Corporation's website.
17. The City Corporation will prepare an annual report for the CIL Neighbourhood Fund as a separate item within the wider annual CIL and s106 monitoring report. The Neighbourhood Fund monitoring will include details of:

- Total CIL Neighbourhood Fund receipts for the reporting year;
 - Total CIL Neighbourhood Fund expenditure for the reporting year;
 - Details of CIL Neighbourhood Fund expenditure for the reporting year, including the amount spent on each individual project;
 - Total CIL Neighbourhood Fund monies remaining.
18. City Communities will be consulted on an annual basis on community priorities for the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund. A full review of the Neighbourhood Fund, including priorities and governance, will be undertaken at least every 5 years.

Neighbourhood Fund Application Process

19. The application process will be managed by the City Corporation's Central Grants Unit. Information about the Neighbourhood Fund and how to apply will be posted on the City Corporation's website at: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>
20. Fund applications can be made at any time and should be submitted via an online application form which will be posted on the City Corporation's website.

Organisations eligible to bid for funding

21. Neighbourhood Fund applications will be accepted from the following types of organisation:
- Constituted voluntary organisations and resident associations
 - Constituted business organisations and associations
 - Registered charities
 - Registered community interest companies
 - Charitable companies (incorporated as not for profit)
 - Registered charitable incorporated organisations
 - Exempt or excepted charities
 - Registered charitable industrial and provident society or charitable cooperative.

22. Applications should be from City-based organisations or should demonstrate City-based support. Applications cannot be accepted from individuals. Individuals who wish to apply for funding should do so through a City-based constituted organisation or group falling into the above definition. Applications will not be accepted from political parties or organisations involved in political lobbying.
23. Applications from City Corporation service departments will be accepted where they:
- Have the support of a City-based community group, or
 - Can demonstrate that delivery will meet community priorities, either through consultation with communities, or through an adopted City Corporation strategy which can demonstrate community support.
24. Applications for infrastructure funding to mitigate the direct impacts of development will not be accepted. Such mitigation should be delivered as part of the development process and funded through s106 Planning Obligations.

Assistance with Applications

25. The Central Grants Unit can provide assistance to applicants with the completion of application forms. Contact details are available on the City Corporation's website. The Central Grants Unit cannot provide assistance with project management or delivery of schemes funded through the Neighbourhood Fund.

Assessment Criteria

26. Applications should demonstrate that funding will be used to meet the Regulatory requirements for CIL funding set out in Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations, namely to support the development of the area by:
- a. the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or
 - b. anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.
27. Infrastructure improvements funded through the Neighbourhood Fund should deliver improvements necessary to support development of the City. Normally, such funding will deliver new infrastructure, but funding will also be available to meet reasonable on-going maintenance costs.

Applications should, therefore, identify and include an allowance for future maintenance of any infrastructure to be provided.

28. CIL Regulations allow greater flexibility in the use of the Neighbourhood Fund compared with other CIL expenditure. Neighbourhood Funds may therefore be used to fund revenue expenditure. To avoid creating long term commitments on the Neighbourhood Fund, any requests for revenue funding should be clearly justified, showing demonstrable community benefit, and time limited to a maximum of 5 years.
29. In recognition of the value in providing continuous and consistent support to City communities through work funded via the CIL Neighbourhood Fund, organisations will be permitted to reapply for funding at the end of a grant. Any organisation seeking to reapply to the CILNF will have to demonstrate a successful track record of delivering positive outcomes for City communities in their previously funded work. The CIL Neighbourhood Fund will need to balance a portfolio of existing organisations and new applicants to the CIL Neighbourhood Fund to ensure that the funds available are not concentrated in a small number of returning organisations.
30. For larger projects of over £50,000, applications should also consider whether the project meets the priorities identified in the City Corporation's Regulation 123 List and projects identified in City Corporation strategies that have been subject to public consultation. Funding decisions will not be made solely on the basis of compliance, or otherwise, with the Regulation 123 List.
31. Applications should include evidence of the feasibility, deliverability and sustainability of the project.
32. Where possible, the application should be supported by a delivery plan or business plan, which sets out the timescales for delivery, that any necessary consents have been obtained and the mechanisms in place to ensure that the funds are used appropriately.
33. Projects should be delivered within a 12 month period from the grant of funding unless an alternative timescale has been agreed. If delivery over a longer timescale is anticipated, this should be set out clearly in the application and a justification provided for the extended timescale. The City Corporation will monitor delivery of projects, including taking action to ensure that projects are delivered on time, or seek to recover funds if projects do not proceed within agreed parameters.

34. Applications for funding in excess of £50,000 should demonstrate how the project will deliver value for money, including through the identification of any contributory or match funding. This can include contributions in time or expertise, for example, where a local community delivers infrastructure improvements themselves, but is not necessary for a successful bid.
35. Applications to fund projects which are already in receipt of other City CIL funding, or s106, s278 funding for site specific mitigation will not normally be accepted.
36. Developers may wish to support an application from a constituted City-based organisation or group, as set out above, where the proposed infrastructure cannot be delivered through other means.

Value of Bids

37. The minimum value for applications for infrastructure funding is £1,000.
38. Individual applications should normally not exceed £500,000. Information on the available funds will be published on the City Corporation's website on a quarterly basis to inform applications.
39. Applications in excess of £500,000 will only be considered in exceptional circumstances, where there is demonstrable benefit to more than one of the City's communities and where the proposal aligns with other City Corporation ambitions, set out in published strategies.

Awards Process

40. The determination of applications will be made through a combination of officer delegation and Committee approval, depending on the financial value of the application. The adopted thresholds accord with those used by the City Bridge Trust in its consideration of grant applications.
41. Funding applications for under £25,000 will be determined by City Corporation officers under delegated authority. Decisions should normally be made within 12 weeks of the receipt of a valid application.
42. Applications for between £25,000 and £50,000 will be determined by a panel of City Corporation officers under delegated authority and in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee. Decisions should normally be made within 16 weeks of the receipt of a valid application.

43. Decisions taken under delegated authority will be reported to the Resource Allocations Sub-Committee.
44. Applications for over £50,000 will be considered by the City Corporation's Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, normally on a quarterly basis. Applications will be considered as items in the public part of the meeting agenda.

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s): Policy and Resources Committee	Dated: 7 July 2022
Subject: Follow-Up Paper to Responsible Procurement Policy Update	Public
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	N
If so, how much?	£
What is the source of Funding?	
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: Chief Operating Officer	For Decision
Report author: Lisa Moore, Responsible Procurement Manager	

Summary

This is a follow-up paper in response to the discussion on the Responsible Procurement Policy Update paper by Policy & Resources (P&R) Committee in June 2022. Officers were asked to respond to the following member queries:

- Can we provide a timeline for SMEs to show the aims and ambitions of the implementation period?
- How does the Supplier Diversity commitment align to the forthcoming SME strategy?
- Can we accelerate the 15% responsible procurement (RP) tender weighting for large companies ahead of the proposed 2023 uplift?

This paper sets out the response and any proposed actions:

Supplier engagement will be a key focus over the next few months in order to support implementation of the new policy. A timeline for supplier guidance and engagement will be provided to P&R in September.

The Corporation's SME strategy is focused on SMEs located within in the square mile. The commitment in the RP policy takes a much broader view and seeks to enable more UK SMEs to enter our supply chain. The Responsible Procurement Manager sits on the officer-led SME Working Group providing input and review of the SME strategy and is taking an active role in championing Supplier Diversity.

Officers have sought further legal input regarding options for the responsible procurement evaluation weighting. Given the constraints of the UK's Public Contracts Regulations and the clear risk of challenge, it is not advised to set variegated weightings (within the same tender) dependent on bidder type. The Policy will however advise buying officers and category boards that the move to the minimum of 15% weighting should happen as soon as possible, and no later than 2023.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to approve:

- Approve changes to the Responsible Procurement Policy, in particular refocusing from 18 commitments to the proposed six.
- Approve amendment to the responsible procurement weighting establishing it as an overall score of 15% by September 2022.
- Approve that for any categories of spend where it is evidenced that the move to 15% may negatively disrupt the market, the overall score moves to a minimum of 10% from 1 September 2022 and to 15% by no later than 1 April 2023.

Main Report

Background

1. The remainder of this paper will focus on providing further information in regard to the recommendation to change the RP evaluation weighting.
2. The June Responsible Procurement Policy Update paper asked Members to consider the recommendations set out above including a two-step increase in the RP weighting to 10% in September 2022 and 15% in April 2023. In making this recommendation, the following options were also previously reviewed:
 - Update the policy and policy commitments to make RP more accessible and provide greater clarity for implementation while maintaining the integrity of the current RP Policy.
 - Amend the RP weighting to an overall score in line with central government and our peers in London.
 - Uplift the 10% RP weighting to 15% in April 2023.

Current Position

3. Regulation 18 of the UK's Public Contracts Regulations 2015 states we shall treat suppliers 'equally and without discrimination and [we] shall act in a transparent and proportionate manner' and 'competition shall be considered to be artificially narrowed where the design of the procurement is made with the intention of unduly favouring or disadvantaging certain economic operators.' We open ourselves up to potential challenge, if our procurement processes are perceived as being unequal. The risk of challenge is an important one as it could potentially lead to delays in delivering key programmes or activity, increased costs and significant reputational damage.
4. Additionally, a possible unintended consequence could be that SME suppliers who have invested in their responsible procurement offerings, are actually put at a disadvantage to suppliers who have been given a higher weighting.
5. Use of a 'two-tiered' approach or a different weighting for large and SME suppliers may also reduce competition due to bidder's perceived unfairness or anticipation of challenge to any contract award.

6. Lastly, whilst the evaluation weighting is an important tool in delivering our RP Policy, there are other important activities that arguably have a more significant impact on the ability of small businesses to successfully compete. The refreshed Policy aims to simplify our approach to specifically help small businesses to more easily engage in the process. Our RP questions are designed so that different sized organisations, and organisations without bid writers, can answer the question fairly. We often use a menu system, provide guidance on what we are looking for and set the weighted aspect of questions to focus on delivery and impact rather than the size/amount of the offering.

Supporting small businesses to compete

7. The Policy sets out a clear Corporation commitment and approach to delivering added-value through our procurement spend. We will communicate to buyers and category boards, that the higher minimum RP weighting is to be achieved by September 2022 for most categories of spend and, in particular, in scenarios where market engagement indicates that only large suppliers will bid or the market indication shows the relevant RP offering is mature.
8. Officers are encouraged to look for opportunities to ring-fence or identify contracts which could be reserved for SMEs. This should be considered at the business planning and procurement options stages.
9. Commercial Services will use the additional seven months (for those categories where further development is required) to ensure we are proactively engaging with the market, seeking feedback on further improvements to our processes and, that we ensure resources are available online to make it clear what the City Corporation is looking for and what 'good' looks like. This should help suppliers that do not have the same bid writing capacity as some of the large suppliers.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

10. Strategic implications – The recommendations in the paper support the Corporate Plan and the City Corporation's aspirations to be leaders in responsible business. The timeframes set out in the report, allows the Corporation to undertake market engagement and provide guidance to the SME community to facilitate and encourage their inclusion in our tendering processes.
11. Financial implications – The RP policy is designed to deliver added-value. The proposals, as recommended, will allow us to work with the SME community which we anticipate will allow for more competition and better value overall.
12. Resource implications – No change to the implications outlined in the original paper.
13. Legal implications – Commercial Services consulted with the Chief Solicitor in Contracts Team of the Comptroller's Department and other than those illustrated in this paper, there are no particular issues of concern.

- 14. Risk implications – Additional risk implications are outlined in this paper.
- 15. Equalities implications – No change to the implications outlined in the original paper.
- 16. Climate implications – No change to the implications outlined in the original paper.
- 17. Security implications – None

Conclusion

- 18. Members are asked to approve the recommendations as outlined in this paper. Officers will take away the actions outlined in this paper and further guidance will be communicated through the category boards that the higher RP weighing is to be employed sooner where appropriate.

Background Papers

9 June 2022 – Policy & Resources Committee Paper – Responsible Procurement Policy Update

Lisa Moore

Responsible Procurement Manager

T: 02073323273 E: lisa.moore@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 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank