



## Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee

**Date:** THURSDAY, 30 NOVEMBER 2023  
**Time:** 9.00 am  
**Venue:** COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL

**Members:**

Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)	The Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor
Deputy Henry Colthurst (Deputy Chairman)	Ald. Michael Mainelli
Deputy Randall Anderson	Deputy Andrien Meyers
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Deputy Alastair Moss
Tijs Broeke	Alderman Sir William Russell
Jason Groves	Ruby Sayed
Caroline Haines	Tom Sleigh
Deputy Shravan Joshi	Deputy Sir Michael Snyder
Catherine McGuinness	Deputy James Thomson

**Enquiries:** Ben Dunleavy  
[ben.dunleavy@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:ben.dunleavy@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

### Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:

<https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one civic 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.

Whilst we endeavour to livestream all of our public meetings, this is not always possible due to technical difficulties. In these instances, if possible, a recording will be uploaded following the end of the meeting.

**Ian Thomas CBE**  
**Town Clerk and Chief Executive**



# AGENDA

1. **APOLOGIES**

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

3. **MINUTES**

To agree the public minutes and non-public summary of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 2 November 2023.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 7 - 10)

4. **CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE**

Report of the Chamberlain.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 11 - 24)

5. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND – APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL**

Report of the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 25 - 46)

6. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND – APPROVAL OF UPDATED COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND POLICY**

Report of the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 47 - 88)

7. **BEMS UPGRADE PROGRAMME – PHASE 2**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 89 - 108)

8. **CITY SURVEYOR'S BUSINESS PLAN 2023-28 QUARTER 2 2023/24 UPDATE**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Information**

9. **THE CITY SURVEYOR'S CORPORATE AND DEPARTMENTAL RISK REGISTER – NOVEMBER 2023 UPDATE**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Information**

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

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

12. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

**Part 2 – Non-Public Agenda**

13. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

To agree the non-public minutes of the Sub-Committee meeting held on 2 November 2023.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 109 - 112)

14. **CITIGEN OPTIONS REVIEW APPROACH UPDATE**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 113 - 130)

15. **GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC & DRAMA HEATING, COOLING & VENTILATION REPLACEMENT**

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

**For Decision**  
(Pages 131 - 146)

16. **ANNUAL REPORT ON OPERATIONAL PROPERTY PORTFOLIO**

Report of the City Surveyor.

**For Information**

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

## RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Thursday, 2 November 2023

Minutes of the meeting of the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 2 November 2023 at 9.30 am

### Present

#### Members:

Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)	Alderman Professor Michael Mainelli
Deputy Randall Anderson	Alderman Sir William Russell
Jason Groves	Ruby Sayed
Deputy Shravan Joshi	

### In Attendance

#### Members observing online:

Caroline Haines  
Tom Sleigh  
Deputy Madush Gupta

#### Officers:

Michael Cogher	- Comptroller and City Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive
Bob Roberts	- Executive Director Environment (Interim)
Ian Hughes	- Environment
Paul Wilkinson	- City Surveyor
Peter Young	- City Surveyor's Department
Richard Chamberlain	- City Surveyor's Department
Joanne Hunneybell	- City Surveyor's Department
Peter Ochser	- City Surveyor's Department
Sonia Virdee	- Chamberlain's Department
Daniel Peattie	- Chamberlain's Department
Radwan Ahmed	- Chamberlain's Department
Emily Tofield	- Executive Director of Corporate Communications and External Affairs
Dionne Corradine	- Chief Strategy Officer
Zakki Ghauri	- Chief Operating Officer's Department
Benjamin Dixon	- Office of the Policy Chairman
Emily Slatter	- Office of the Policy Chairman
Polly Dunn	- Town Clerk's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Deputy Henry Colthurst, Deputy James Thomson, Deputy Keith Bottomley and Tijs Broeke. Alderman Tim Hailes, who has formally been invited to observe the meetings, also gave apologies.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**, that the public minutes and non-public summary from the meeting held on 5 October 2023 be approved as a correct record.

4. **CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE**

Members received a report of the Chamberlain providing an update on capital funding.

**RESOLVED**, that Members agree to:

- a) review the schemes summarised in Table 2 and, particularly in the context of the current financial climate, to confirm their continued essential priority for release of funding at this time and accordingly:
- b) release up to £1.104m for the schemes progressing to the next Gateway in Table 2 from the reserves of City Fund (£4.604m), City Cash (0.21m) and City Bridge Foundation (0.08m)
- c) release of £0.076m of City Cash contingency as described within the report.

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

There were no questions.

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

There were no items of other business. However, a query was raised as to why item 9 was to be considered in non-public.

Officers agreed this exclusion should be reconsidered in time for the Policy & Resources Committee (due to meet in coming weeks) and confirmed that, if possible, the minutes of the discussion be made public.

7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED**, That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

8. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

**RESOLVED**, that the non-public minutes from the meeting held on 5 October 2023 be approved as a correct record.



9. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) AND ON STREET PARKING RESERVE (OSPR) CAPITAL BIDS (QUARTER 2 - 2023/24) & CAPITAL BIDS FOR 2024/25 CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

Members received a joint report of the Chamberlain and the Executive Director, Environment concerning the Community Infrastructure Levy, the On Street Parking Reserve and the 2024/25 Capital Programme.

**RESOLVED** – that for projects bids considered under City CIL and OSPR funding, Members:

- a) Review the project bids in line with the eligibility and prioritisation criteria as set out in Appendix 1.
- b) Note the forecast balances for City CIL and OSPR as detailed in paras 2.1 and 2.2 of the report, which incorporates the recommendations of the Priorities Board,
- c) Recommend to Policy and Resources, and for Policy and Resources Committee to approve, the allocation of City CIL and OSPR funding to the three revenue schemes (listed in section 3.1 and detailed in Appendix 2):
  - i. City Gardens Revenue Budget
  - ii. Ground Penetrating Radar Survey (GPRS) for Infrastructure Strategy; and
  - iii. Street Furniture ASB Protection Measures; and

For new capital bids for the financial year 2024/25, Members:

- a) Approve the new capital bids submitted (listed in section 3.2 and detailed in appendix 2), amounts requested and purposes for which these are requested, including two schemes funded by CIL (Bid AB2 – City Cluster Programme) and OSPR monies (Bid AB1 – Car Parks Fire and Safety).
- b) Approve the recommendations of the Priorities Board in relation to three schemes of the fourteen Capital and SRP bids. These are listed below with further detail found in paragraph 3.26.
  - i. Network Contract - Support and Refresh,
  - ii. Corporate Device Stock Replacement
  - iii. Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) Replacement
- c) To note new bids which require funding from City Bridge Foundation (CBF), will need to be considered as being in the best interests of the charity, noting the separate legal duties of the City Corporation as a Trustee.
- d) Note that the final decision for capital bids for inclusion in the 2024/25 draft budgets will be confirmed at the joint meeting of RASC and the Service Committee Chairmen and City Bridge Foundation Board in January 2024, with final approval in February /March by Finance Committee and the Court of Common Council
- e) Note the future funding requirements under section 7 of the report.

10. **GW5: GUILDHALL COOLING PLANT REPLACEMENT**  
Members received a report of the City Surveyor concerning the Guildhall Cooling Plant Replacement project.
11. **DELEGATED AUTHORITY DECISIONS AND ARREARS UPDATE FOR GUILDHALL AND WALBROOK WHARF - 1ST APRIL TO 30TH SEPTEMBER 2023**  
Members received a report of the City Surveyor concerning decisions taken under the City Surveyor's delegations.
12. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**  
There were no questions.
13. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**  
There was no other business.

**The meeting ended at 9.54 am**

-----  
Chairman

**Contact Officer: Polly Dunn**  
**[polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:polly.dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk)**

# Agenda Item 4

<b>Committee(s):</b> Resource Allocation Sub Committee Policy & Resources Committee	<b>Date(s):</b> 30 November 2023 14 December 2023
<b>Subject:</b> Capital Funding Update	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	The schemes for which funding is now requested span across a range of corporate outcomes
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	Yes
<b>If so, how much?</b>	£0.389m
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	£0.234m from City Fund CIL, £0.155m from City Cash
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	Yes
<b>Report of:</b> The Chamberlain	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Yasin Razaq, Capital and Projects Manager	

## Summary

This report follows on from previous papers on capital prioritisation, the capital review and the 2020/21, 2021/22 and 2022/23 rounds of annual capital bids.

Members are reminded of the two-step funding mechanism via the annual capital bid process:

- Firstly, within available funding, 'in principle' approval to the highest priority bids is sought and appropriate provisions are set aside in the annual capital and revenue budgets within the MTFPs.
- Secondly, following scrutiny via the gateway process to provide assurance of robust option appraisal, project management and value for money, Members are asked to confirm that these schemes remain a priority for which funding should be released at this time.

The purpose of this report is for Members to consider release (following gateway approvals) to allow schemes to progress.

The approved annual capital bids for 2020/21 currently total £87.1m of which draw-downs of £38.1m have been approved to date. A schedule of the current 2020/21 allocations is included as Appendix 1 for information.

The second annual bid round for 2021/22 granted in principle funding approval to bids with a current value of £82.5m of which draw-downs of £17.1m have been agreed. A schedule of the current 2021/22 allocations is included in Appendix 2.

The approved annual capital bids for 2022/23 total £26.7m of which draw-downs of £7.4m have been agreed. A schedule of the current 2022/23 allocations is included in Appendix 3.

Release of £0.389m to allow progression of three schemes summarised in Table 2 'Project Funding Requests' is now requested.

### **Recommendations**

Resource Allocation Sub Committee Members and Policy & Resources Committee are requested to:-

- (i) Review the schemes summarised in Table 2 and, particularly in the context of the current financial climate, to confirm their continued essential priority for release of funding at this time and accordingly:
- (ii) Agree the release of up to £0.389m for the schemes progressing to the next Gateway in Table 2 from City Fund CIL (£0.234m) and City Cash (0.155m)

## Main Report

### Background

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

The above criteria were used as the basis for prioritising the annual capital bids and should continue to be applied when consider release of funds.

3. The scope of schemes subject to this prioritisation relates only to those funded from central sources, which include the On-Street Parking Reserve, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), flexible external contributions and allocations from the general reserves of City Fund, City's Cash or CBF<sup>1</sup>. This means that projects funded from most ring-fenced funds, such as the Housing Revenue Account, Designated Sales Pools and Cyclical Works Programmes *are excluded*, as well as schemes wholly funded from external grants, and tenant/developer contributions e.g. under S278 agreements and S106 deposits.
4. Members are reminded of the two-step funding mechanism via the annual capital bid process:
  - Firstly, 'in principle' approval to the highest priority bids within available funding is sought and appropriate provisions are set aside in the annual capital and revenue budgets and the MTFPs.
  - Secondly, following scrutiny via the gateway process to provide assurance of robust option appraisal, project management and value for money, RASC is asked to confirm that these schemes remain a priority for which funding should be released at this time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Contributions from City Bridge Foundation are limited to its share of corporate schemes such as works to the Guildhall Complex or corporate IT systems and are subject to the specific approval of the Bridge House Estates Board.

## Current Position

5. From the 2020/21 bid round, central funding of £87.1m is currently allocated for new capital bids across the three main funds. To date, £37.8m has been drawn down to allow 37 of these schemes to be progressed. A schedule of the current 2020/21 allocations is included in Appendix 1 for information.
6. Central funding of a further £82.5m across the three main funds for the 2021/22 new bids is currently allocated, of which drawdowns of £13.2m has been approved in respect of 19 schemes. A schedule of the 2021/22 allocations is included in Appendix 2 for information.
7. Central Funding of £26.7m has been agreed for the 2022/23 new bids of which draw-downs of £6.6m have been approved in respect of 12 schemes. A schedule of the 2022/23 allocations is included in Appendix 3 for information.
8. In addition, there are a small number of ongoing schemes for which funding was allocated as part of the Fundamental Review (such as Wanstead Park Ponds).
9. All schemes in this report have been through the capital review as part of a reprioritisation and value-engineering exercise to mitigate the effects of significant inflationary pressures. These pressures need to be carefully managed over the short to medium term to prevent a potential significant overspend. In instances where capital projects are approved assuming any element of external funding, risks must be managed to prevent additional unplanned cost pressures impacting on central funding.
10. The Enhancing Cheapside scheme was part of the 2023 CIL and OSPR Capital Bids (Quarter 1 - 2023/24) paper that was approved by RASC on the 5th September.

## Current Requests for the Release of Funding

11. There are three schemes with 'in principle' funding approved as part of the capital bids that have progressed through the gateways, for which release of up to £0.389m is requested:

<b>Table 2: Project Funding Requests</b>	Next Gateway	Funding Status	Capital Bid Round	City Fund	City's Cash	Bridge House Estates	Total
				£m	£m	£m	£m
<b>Funding to progress to next Gateway</b>							
Guildhall School of Music & Drama Heating, Cooling & Ventilation	GW4		2021/22		0.155		0.155
Barbican and Golden Lane Healthy Streets	GW3		2021/22	0.109			0.109
Enhancing Cheapside	GW3/4		2023/24	0.125			0.125
				<b>0.234</b>	<b>0.155</b>	-	<b>0.389</b>

12. Further details of the individual schemes are provided in Appendix 4 attached.

13. In accordance with step two of the capital funding mechanism, Members will wish to confirm that these schemes remain a priority for funding to be released at this time particularly in the context of the current financial climate.
14. Funding for these schemes can be met from the provisions set aside from the CIL balances of the City Fund £0.234m and £0.155m from City Cash.

### **Conclusion**

15. Members are requested to:
  - 1) review the above and consider in the context of the completion of the capital review and the current financial climate their continued support for the schemes requesting internal resources to proceed, and;
  - 2) approve the associated release of funding in Table 2.

### **Appendices**

Appendix 1 - 2020/21 Approved Bids

Appendix 2 - 2021/22 Approved Bids

Appendix 3 - 2022/23 Approved Bids

Appendix 4 - Requests for Release of Funding – Scheme Details

### **Background Papers**

- Annual Capital Prioritisation Report, 12 December 2019 (Non-Public).
- Prioritisation of Remaining 2020/21 Annual Capital Bids (Deferred from December 2019 Meeting), 23 January 2020 (Non-Public)
- Re-prioritisation of 2020/21 Approved Capital Bids, 18 September 2020 (Non-Public)
- Capital Funding – Prioritisation of 2021/22 Annual Capital Bids – Stage 2 Proposals, 10 December 2020 (Public)
- Capital Funding – Prioritisation of 2022/23 Annual Capital Bids – Stage 2 Final Proposals
- Capital Review 2022 – final recommendations to RASC

### **Yasin Razaq**

Capital & Projects Manager

Email: [Yasin.Razaq@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Yasin.Razaq@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank



## Appendix 1

Approved Bids 2020/21						THIS REPORT		THIS REPORT	
Project Name	City Fund £'m	City's Cash £'m	BHE £'m	Total Funding Allocation £'m	Funding Allocation After Re- prioritisation	Release of Funding Previously agreed	Reallocation of Funding now requested	Release of Funding now requested	
<b>Critical End of Life Replacement</b>									
Barbican Replacement of Art Gallery Chiller	0.300	-	-	0.300	0.300	0.018			
Car Park - London Wall Joints and Waterproofing	2.000	-	-	2.000	2.000	-			
Car Park - Hampstead Heath, East Heath Car Park Resurface	-	0.415	-	0.415	0.415	0.387			
Central Criminal Court - Replacement for Heating, Cooling and Electrics for the East Wing Mezzanine including the sheriff's apartments.*****	1.000	-	-	1.000	0.626	0.626			
Finsbury Circus Garden Re-instatement	2.558	-	-	2.558	2.558	2.542			
Guildhall - North and East Wing Steam Generator replacement – including Art Gallery	0.744	0.396	0.060	1.200	0.002	0.002			
Guildhall - West Wing - Space Cooling - Chiller Plant & Cooling Tower Replacement *****	1.860	0.990	0.150	3.000	4.702	4.554			
Guildhall event spaces - Audio & Visual replacement / upgrade	-	0.330	-	0.330	0.330	0.045			
Guildhall Yard - Refurbishment/ Replacement of Pavours	-	3.000	-	3.000	3.000	-			
I.T - Computer Equipment rooms (CER) Uninterrupted Power Supplies (UPS)Upgrades and Replacements	0.090	0.100	0.010	0.200	0.200	0.200			
I.T - Essential Computer (Servers) operating system refresh programme	0.068	0.075	0.008	0.151	0.095	0.095			
I.T - Personal device replacement (Laptops, Desktops and tablet/mobile device)	1.013	1.125	0.112	2.250	2.250	2.250			
I.T - Rationalisation of Financials, HR & Payroll Systems (ERP project)	2.654	2.949	0.295	5.898	9.800	0.68			
I.T - Telephony replacement ***	0.873	0.343	0.034	1.250	-	-			
LMA : Replacement of Fire Alarm, Chillers and Landlords Lighting and Power	1.397	-	-	1.397	1.397	0.145			
Oracle Property Management System Replacement	0.713	0.380	0.058	1.151	1.151	1.150			
Structural - Lindsey Street Bridge Strengthening	5.000	-	-	5.000	5.000	0.030			
Structural - Dominant House Footbridge*****	1.025	-	-	1.025	0.575	0.575			
Structural - West Ham Park Playground Refurbishment	-	1.279	-	1.279	1.279	0.863			
<b>Fully or substantially reimbursable</b>									
Barbican Turret John Wesley High Walk	0.043	-	-	0.043	0.043	0.043			
Chingford Golf Course Development Project	-	0.075	-	0.075	0.075	-			
<b>High Profile Policy Initiative</b>									
Bank Junction Transformation (All Change at Bank)	4.000	-	-	4.000	4.000	4.000			
Culture Mile Implementation Phase 1 incl CM experiments and Culture Mile Spine	0.580	-	-	0.580	0.580	0.580			
I.T - Smarter working for Members and Officers	0.113	0.125	0.013	0.251	0.185	0.185			
Rough Sleeping - assessment hub*****	1.000	-	-	1.000	1.196	1.498			
Rough Sleeping High Support Hostel - Option 3	0.500	-	-	0.500	0.500	0.500			
Secure City Programme	15.852	-	-	15.852	15.852	7.174			
<b>Statutory Compliance/Health and Safety</b>									
Barbican Exhibition Halls	5.000	-	-	5.000	1.549	1.548			
Barbican Podium Waterproofing, Drainage and Landscaping Works (Ben Jonson, Breton & Cromwell Highwalk) Phase 2 – 1st Priority	13.827	-	-	13.827	13.827	2.417			
Covid19 Phase 3 Transportation Response*	-	-	-	-	0.568	0.568			
City of London Primary Academy Islington (COLPAI) temporary site	-	0.300	-	0.300	0.583	0.583			
Golden Lane Lighting and Accessibility	0.500	-	-	0.500	0.500	0.500			
Guildhall - Great Hall - Internal Stonework Overhaul	-	2.000	-	2.000	2.000	1.740			
Guildhall - Installation of Public Address & Voice Alarm (PAVA) and lockdown system at the Guildhall (Security Recommendation)	0.930	0.495	0.075	1.500	1.500	0.118			
I.T - Critical Security Works agreed by the DSSC **	0.112	0.125	0.013	0.250	-	-			
I.T - GDPR and Data Protection Compliance in addition saving money in being able to share and find information quickly	0.090	0.100	0.010	0.200	0.200	-			
Confined and Dangerous Spaces - Barbican Centre	2.000	-	-	2.000	2.000	0.098			
Confined and Dangerous Spaces - GSMD	-	0.400	-	0.400	0.400	0.019			
Fire Safety - Car Park London Wall - Ventilation, electrics, lighting and fire alarm works	1.370	-	-	1.370	1.370	0.240			
Fire Safety - Works in car parks	1.032	-	-	1.032	1.032	0.699			
Fire Safety - Frobisher Crescent, Barbican Estate (compartmentation) *	0.550	-	-	0.550	1.203	1.203			
Fire Safety - Smithfield sprinkler head replacement and fire door replacement.	-	0.150	-	0.150	0.150	0.020			
Queen's Park Public Toilet Rebuild	-	0.380	-	0.380	-	-			
Spitalfields Flats Fire Door Safety	0.146	-	-	0.146	0.146	-			
<b>Spend to save with a payback &lt; 5 years</b>									
Energy programme of lighting and M&E upgrade works (Phase 1)****	0.440	0.489	0.049	0.978	0.268	0.165			
I.T - GDPR Compliance Project Unstructured data	0.112	0.125	0.013	0.250	-	-			
Wanstead Flats Artificial Grass Pitches (spend to save > 5 years)	-	-	-	-	1.700	-			
The Monument Visitor Centre	-	2.500	-	2.500	-	-			
<b>Total Approved Funding Bids</b>	<b>69.492</b>	<b>18.646</b>	<b>0.900</b>	<b>89.038</b>	<b>87.107</b>	<b>38.062</b>	-	-	-

<b>Previous Funding Allocation</b>	89.038
Net reductions from previous reprioritisation exercise (September 2020)	- 4.032
* Reallocated from the 2021/22 annual bids and fundamental review schemes	0.653
* £0.500m of capital funding foregone in place of revenue funding solution (telephony/security)	- 0.500
*** £0.250m of capital funding foregone in place of a revenue funding solution (telephony/security)	- 0.250
****Reallocation of £0.229m to 2021/22 scheme (BEMS Phase 1)	- 0.229
****£0.246m of central funding no longer required and returned to the centre	- 0.246
*****£0.374 reallocated to Walbrook Wharf M&E replacement project	- 0.374
***** £0.269 central contingency reallocated to meet increased cost	0.269
***** £0.196m increase at G5 approved under Urgency	0.196
***** £0.450m of central funding no longer required and returned to the centre	- 0.450
Additional amount for ERP( October 2022)	3.032
	<b>87.107</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 2

Approved Bids 2021/22				THIS REPORT	THIS REPORT			
Project Name	City Fund £'m	City's Cash £'m	CBF £'m	Total Funding Allocation £'m	Latest Funding Allocation after Reprioritisation	Release of Funding Previously agreed	Reallocation of Funding now requested	Release of Funding now requested
<b>Critical End of Life Replacement</b>								
OSD - Tower Hill Play Area Replacement Project	0.120			0.120	0.120	0.120		
SVY - BEMS Upgrade Project-CPG Estate – Phase	0.507	0.375	0.022	0.904	1.133	0.626		
SVY - Smithfield Condenser Pipework Replacement		0.564		0.564	0.564			
CHB - IT SD WAN /MPLS replacement	0.320	0.145	0.035	0.500	0.100	0.100		
CHB - IT LAN Support to Replace Freedom Contract	0.096	0.043	0.011	0.150	0.150			
CHB - Libraries IT Refresh	0.220			0.220	0.220			
BBC - Barbican Centre - Catering Block Extraction	0.400			0.400	0.400	0.024		
<b>High Profile Policy Initiative</b>								
DBE - Secure City Programme Year 2	4.739			4.739	4.739	1.700		
SVY - Guildhall Complex Masterplan - initial feasibility and design work		0.350		0.350	0.350	0.350		
<b>Statutory Compliance/Health and Safety</b>								
DCCS - Fire Doors Barbican Estate*	20.000			20.000	19.597	0.275		
SVY - St Lawrence Jewry Church - Essential works (Top-Up Funding)		2.565		2.565	2.565	2.136		
SVY - Denton Pier and Pontoon Overhaul Works	1.000			1.000	1.000	0.050		
OSD - Hampstead Heath Swimming Facilities - Safety, Access and Security Improvements		0.755		0.755	0.755	0.755		
DBE - Public Realm Security Programme	1.238			1.238	1.238	0.027		
DBE - Beech Street Transportation and Public Realm project (Top-Up Bid)	0.900			0.900	0.900	0.191		
MAN - Central Criminal Courts, Fire Safety and associated public address system (Top-up bid)	0.683			0.683	0.683			
MAN - Central Criminal Court Cell Area Ducting and Extract System Balancing	1.000			1.000	1.000	0.220		
SVY - Riverbank House, Swan Lane - repairs to foreshore river defence	0.500			0.500	0.500	0.438		
CHB - Public Services Network replacement	0.064	0.029	0.007	0.100	0.000			
GSMD - Guildhall School of Music & Drama Heating, Cooling & Ventilation		2.000		2.000	2.000	0.200		0.155
GSMD - Guildhall School - Milton Court Correction of Mechanical Systems		0.600		0.600	0.600			
GSMD - Guildhall School - John Hosier Ventilation and Temperature Control		0.700		0.700	0.700			
CHB - IT Security**	0.192	0.087	0.021	0.300	0.000			
<b>Spend to save with a payback &lt; 5 years</b>								
SVY - Energy Reduction Programme – Phase 2	0.194	0.181		0.375	0.375			
<b>Sub-Total - Bids Fulfilling the Funding Criteria</b>	<b>32.173</b>	<b>8.394</b>	<b>0.096</b>	<b>40.663</b>	<b>39.689</b>	<b>7.212</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.155</b>
<b>Climate Action :</b>								
DBE - Public Realm (Pedestrian Priority)	6.050			6.050	6.050	2.454		
OSD - Climate Action Strategy		2.120		2.120	2.120	0.795		
DBE - Embed climate resilience measures into Public Realm works (Cool Streets and Greening)	6.800			6.800	6.800	6.422		
SVY -Energy Efficiency / Net Zero Carbon - Investment Estate - City Fund	4.340			4.340	4.340			
SVY - Energy Efficiency / Net Zero Carbon - Investment Estate - Strategic Estate City Fund	0.000			-	-			
SVY - Climate Resilience Measures	4.000	0.000		4.000	4.000			
SVY - Climate Action Strategy Projects CPG Operational Properties	11.723	7.138	0.649	19.510	19.510	0.109		
Barbican and Golden Lane Healthy Streets	0.250			0.250		0.114		0.109
<b>Sub-Total - Climate Action</b>	<b>33.163</b>	<b>9.258</b>	<b>0.649</b>	<b>43.070</b>	<b>42.820</b>	<b>9.894</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.109</b>
<b>Total Bids Fulfilling the Funding Criteria</b>	<b>65.336</b>	<b>17.652</b>	<b>0.745</b>	<b>83.733</b>	<b>82.509</b>	<b>17.106</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.264</b>

<b>Previous Funding Allocation</b>	83.483
£0.403m reallocated as top-up funding for the Frobisher Crescent Fire Compartmentation Project (2020/21 Bid)*	-0.403
£0.300m of capital funding foregone in place of a revenue funding solution (telephony/security)**	-0.300
£0.229 reallocated from savings on Energy Reduction Programme (2020/21 bid)***	0.229
Re-prioritised in June 2022 under 'One in - One out' principle****	-0.500
<b>Latest Funding Allocation</b>	<b>82.509</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 3

Approved Bids 2022/23				THIS REPORT THIS REPORT				
Project Name	City Fund £'m	City's Cash £'m	CBF £'m	Total Funding Allocation £'m	Funding Allocation After Re- prioritisation	Release of Funding Previously agreed	Reallocation of Funding now requested	Release of Funding now requested
<b>Critical end of life replacement:</b>								
BEMS Upgrade Phase 2 - Heathrow Animal Reception Centre and various OS sites at 6	0.150	0.100	-	0.250	0.250	0.248		
IT - Members IT refresh (to align with new personal device roll-out for staff)	0.192	0.087	0.021	0.300	0.300	0.300		
IT - Managed Service re-provisioning (one-off costs due to end of current contract)*	0.320	0.145	0.035	0.500	0.500	1.300		
IT - Corporate Managed Print Service (one-off costs due to end of current contract)*	0.032	0.015	0.004	0.050	0.050	0.000		
IT - Server Upgrade/Replacement	0.064	0.029	0.007	0.100	0.100	0.100		
Mansion House - essential roof repairs	-	0.330	-	0.330	0.330			
OS Hampstead Heath - Parliament Hill Athletics Track Resurfacing	-	2.000	-	2.000	2.076	2.076		
Guildhall School - Repairs to roof, expansion joint repairs and drainage and water systems (subject to holistic approach for highwalks, Barbican and School)	-	1.750	-	1.750	1.750			
<b>Health and Safety/Statutory Compliance:</b>								
Fire Safety - Guildhall Complex Fire Stopping all basement and plant areas	0.202	0.210	0.008	0.420	0.420	0.42		
Fire Safety - Baynard House Car Park Sprinklers Replacement (remaining floors)	0.250	-	-	0.250	0.250			
Central Criminal Court: Cells Ventilation - Top-Up bid to meet full scope of statutory requirements. (£1m bid agreed in principle as part of the 2021/22 capital bid round.)	1.000	-	-	1.000	1.000			
OS Epping Forest - COVID-19 Path Restoration Project	-	0.250	-	0.250	0.250			
OS Queen's Park Play Area and Sandpit replacement of equipment	-	0.055	-	0.055	0.055			
Barbican Centre - Replacement of Central Battery Units for Emergency Lighting system	0.280	-	-	0.280	0.280			
Guildhall School - Rigging Infrastructures in Milton Court Concert Hall	-	0.460	-	0.460	0.460			
Guildhall School - Safe technical access and working at height - Silk Street Theatre	-	0.345	-	0.345	0.345			
Smithfield Market - Glass Canopy Overhaul	-	0.300	-	0.300	0.300			
Smithfield Market - East Poultry Avenue Canopy Repairs and Remedial Works	-	0.600	-	0.600	0.600			
Smithfield Car Park - Ceiling Coating and Damp Works	-	1.050	-	1.050	1.050			
Beech Street Transportation and Public Realm project top-up to deliver permanent air quality and associated public realm improvements following successful experiment.	2.500	-	-	2.500	2.500			
DCCS - Social Care Case Management System	0.144	-	-	0.144	0.144			
IT - Building Management System Wired Network to maximise efficiencies of new BEMS systems	0.083	0.038	0.009	0.130	0.130	0.130		
<b>High Priority Policy:</b>								
Secure City Programme - Year 3	8.936	-	-	8.936	8.936	0.4		
IT Security*	0.128	0.058	0.014	0.200	0.100	0.100		
Guildhall Complex Masterplan - Redevelopment of North and West Wing Offices (top-up)	-	1.150	-	1.150	1.150	0.25		
Bank Junction Improvements: All Change at Bank - top-up to cover inflation risk of delivering the minimal scheme	0.700	-	-	0.700	0.700	0.700		
IT - HR System Portal required in advance of the new ERP system delivery*	0.160	0.073	0.017	0.250	0.100	0.100		
Walbrook Wharf Feasibility - 2027 and beyond	0.150	-	-	0.150	0.150	0.150		
St Paul's Gyrotory - Design Development	0.556	-	-	0.556	0.556	0.556		
St Paul's Cathedral External Re-lighting	1.160	-	-	1.160	1.160	0.600		
<b>Total Green Funding Bids</b>	<b>17.007</b>	<b>9.044</b>	<b>0.115</b>	<b>26.166</b>	<b>26.742</b>	<b>7.430</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>
Previous Funding Allocation					26.166			
Re-prioritised in June 2022 under 'One in - One out' principle*					0.300			
IT - Managed Service re-provisioning (one-off costs due to end of current contract)*					0.800			
City Cash Contingency					0.076			
					26.742			

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 4

### Requests for Release of Funding – Scheme Details

The following provides details of the three schemes for which approval to release central funding of £0.389m up to is now sought, as summarised in Table 2 of the main report.

#### Enhancing Cheapside release of £125k of CIL funding to progress the scheme.

- The project proposes to public realm and highways improvements to enhance Cheapside, the City's 'high street'.
- Delivers enhancements to complement existing projects developed in the area by decluttering and rationalising the street furniture along Cheapside; more greening and low maintenance planting, improved pedestrian movement through a change of road layout, enhanced lighting and wayfinding, new seating as well as supporting activation and events.
- £125k to undertake complete the evaluation and design, including site surveys and consultants to progress to GW3/GW4.
- This funding was approved by RASC on 5th Sep 2023 CIL and OSPR Capital Bids (Quarter 1 - 2023/24)
- The overall estimate for the project is £1m with, £500k from CIL and £500k from OSPR.

#### Barbican and Golden Lane Healthy Streets Plan release of £109k of CIL funding to progress the scheme

- Identify opportunities to improve air quality and the experience of walking, cycling and spending time in the Barbican and Golden Lane area and increase greening. The plan will then develop and test the feasibility of traffic management changes required to the highway network to deliver these changes and associated benefits. The ultimate objective of the plan is to reduce traffic, improve air quality and enhance the public realm in the area.
- £104K to progress to GW4 for Stakeholder engagement, including with residents' groups, schools and businesses and appointment of consultancy services to provide advice on the detail and scope of any modelling required, to inform the Healthy Neighbourhood Plan's proposed projects and to meet Transport for London's modelling requirements. The detailed development of proposals and opportunities to comprise a draft Healthy Neighbourhood plan.
- The overall estimate for the project is £250K, previously £114k has been released.

Guildhall School of Music & Drama Heating, Cooling & Ventilation release of £155k to progress

- To improve the environmental conditions across the Silk Street and Milton Court Guildhall School of Music & Drama (GSMD) buildings. Specifically, this project will focus on:  
Silk Street – ventilation, heating and cooling for the entire building  
Milton Court – mechanical systems and controls for specific venue areas
- Release of £101.4K to appoint consultants for professional services to Gateway 3/4 and costed provision of £54k.
- The overall estimate for the project is £2.6m, funded from City Cash.

**30/10/2023 P&R Delegated (for RASC)**



<b>Committee(s):</b> Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee – For decision	<b>Dated:</b> 30/11/2023
<b>Subject:</b> Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund – Applications for Approval	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation.	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Jack Joslin, Head of the Central Grants Unit	

## 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. The Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF) application process is managed by the City Corporation’s Central Grants Unit (CGU), with officers assessing applications and providing support to Committee in the consideration of larger applications.

Members are asked to approve the grants recommended for their consideration at meetings of the CILNF Officer Panel in November 2023.

## Recommendation

Members are recommended to:

1. To approve the grant recommended to **The Running Charity** for £42,652 at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in November 2023 (**Appendix 1**).
2. To approve the grant recommended to **The Lord Mayor’s Appeal** for £90,000 at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in November 2022 (**Appendix 1**).

## Main Report

### Background

1. Management of the City CILNF process is aligned with the City's existing grant allocation process, through the Central Grants Unit. The City CILNF Funding Policy is set out at **Appendix 2**.
2. The City CILNF has been in operation since September 2020, providing a wide range of funding to support City of London Communities. The Grant programme is open access and available to apply to throughout the year. In July 2022 the outcomes of a community consultation were outlined to the Policy and Resources Committee. The public consultation demonstrated strong support for the way the current programme operated.

### Current Position

3. Applications to the CILNF are assessed by the CGU Team in conjunction with the BHE and Charity Finance Team. All eligible applications are then presented to the CILNF Officer Panel. This panel is made up of officers from across CoLC to ensure that all decisions and recommendations have a wide range of expert input. The Officer Panel has representatives from the department of Environment, Community and Children Services, Surveyors, HR, Chamberlain's, Destination City Team and the CGU. All applications over £50,000 are recommended to the Sub-Committee for decision after being assessed and analysed by the panel. This process has been effective to date in utilising all the assets of the officer team in the making of decisions.
4. At its meeting in November 2023, the CILNF Officer Panel considered one application, over £50,000 and one below. **Appendix 1** outlines two grants which Members of the Committee are now asked to approve, Members will note that one grant is for under £50,000, but officers are requesting the Sub-Committee approve to expediate the decision-making process.
5. The current neighbourhood portion of the City CIL funding available for distribution as at October 2023 is just over £5.3 million.

### Corporate & Strategic Implications

6. 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 Contributing to a Flourishing Society and Shaping an Outstanding Environment.
7. 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.
8. 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.

9. 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.
10. 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**

11. Community Infrastructure Levy legislation requires local authorities to reserve between 15% and 25% of CIL receipts for neighbourhood funding. In line with the agreed legislation and City CIL Policy Members of the Sub-Committee are asked to review the two applications received and agree funding.

## **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 – Assessment Pack
- Appendix 2 – CIL Neighbourhood Fund Policy

## **Background Papers**

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

## **Jack Joslin**

Head of Central Grants Unit

E: [jack.joslin@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:jack.joslin@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank



# **Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund**

---

**Assessment Pack – November 2023**

**Sheena Etches & Veronica Pearce**

## Contents

<b>The Running Charity (ref. 21600)</b> .....	3
<b>The Lord Mayor's Appeal (ref. 20192)</b> .....	6

## **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND**

**The Running Charity (ref. 21600)**

**Amount requested: £42,652**

**Amount recommended: £42,652**

**Purpose of grant request:** Do Good, Feel Good: promoting wellness in the City of London through a programme coach for disadvantaged young people and a holistic health club.

**Type of cost: Revenue**

**Ward(s) benefitting: All Wards**

### **The Applicant**

The Running Charity (TRC) is a charitable incorporated organisation (charity no. 1157501) registered in 2014 and established with the mission to utilise the power of running and holistic wellbeing to transform the lives of young people who are vulnerable or at risk. TRC aims to enhance mental and physical health, develop social inclusion and integration by facilitating a running community. TRC specifically target young people who are homeless or at risk of becoming so, aiming to improve their life skills and opportunities for stable housing. It offers development and support services to provide pathways to employment, further education or achieve personal ambitions. TRC is based in the City of London operating across London, Manchester and Leeds.

### **Background and detail of proposal**

TRC is seeking funding of £42,652 towards a full-time Youth Programmes Coach as well as a contribution towards programme costs to develop a health and wellbeing programme and community running club.

The Youth Programme Coach will focus on building and managing a new referral and delivery partnership within the City, supporting young people to achieve improved mental health and essential life skills. Initially, the coach will engage with young people who are referred on a 1:1 basis establishing trust and assessing their specific needs, transitioning into TRC's group sessions as trust is built. TRC takes a trauma-informed approach to its work and deliver bespoke support dependent on the individual's needs – connecting and supporting young people through complex health, housing and social care issues. This often involves collaboration with social workers, local authority housing teams, hostels, health services etc. Funding will enable the Youth Coach to work with 30 young people, delivering 100 1:1 and personal development sessions, along with 200 group sessions and events. Participants mental wellbeing will improve - 90% of young people will improve their mental health outcomes. Group sessions will support young people to reduce their

isolation, improve communication skills, support networks, physical and mental health, it is anticipated that 90% of young people will improve their physical health outcomes. This will be scored by pre and post Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale and the charity's 5-pillar survey.

Funding requested will also provide access to a newly designed coach education course. Those interested will have the option to attend and gain Leadership in Running and Fitness through England Athletics and will be mentored and trained by TRC's coaches to deliver and build a career in coaching. Young people that show exceptional commitment will also be provided opportunities to gain higher level qualifications and be provided paid coaching hours.

TRC is also requesting a small proportion of funding to contribute towards programme costs for a health and wellbeing programme and community running club. This will be partially funded by Fleet Street Quarter Business Improvement District (BID) with TRC having an application under consideration by the Mace Foundation. TRC will engage with a range of businesses; delivering mental wellbeing workshops, provide running and health activities and increase opportunities for young people to gain apprenticeships and work experience, as well as giving residents and workers in the City access to services and a community that will improve their physical and emotional health. Collaborating with local businesses and community groups to deliver an inclusive health and wellbeing programme and running club throughout the Square Mile. This work will be overseen by a full-time employee and supported by graduates of TRC's programmes which will increase delivery capacity and providing increased social mobility to the graduates and an inclusive, accessible opportunity for all. The programme lead will run 300 group health and wellbeing interventions: including running and outdoor fitness sessions, walking clubs and mental health and wellbeing workshops. TRC has substantial experience in delivering activities to corporate partners spanning various sectors, including major sports brands, investment banks, property developers, and legal firms.

TRC is planning for long-term sustainability to ensure this work can continue in the City, strengthening its impact.

### **Financial Information**

TRC's income is derived mainly from donations, grants and gift-in-kind. The organisation has worked on diversifying its income as well as developing multi-year funding opportunities. TRC has been careful to ensure manageable steady growth development as opposed to quick unsustainable development. TRC's reserves policy is to hold at least six months of operating costs, and it currently sits just over this target.

### **Recommendation**

TRC has a track record of delivering this unique work with significant outcomes. This work has strong community benefit with the Youth Programme Coach focusing on young people within the City identified by a range of local referral partners. The nature of the work taking a trauma-informed approach and tailoring support to the individual strengthens young people to make lasting change and achieve positive outcomes. This project meets the aims of the Community Infrastructure Levy



Neighbourhood Fund through the provision of infrastructure. Supporting young people to access a coaching accreditation will further widen community benefit, with the health and wellbeing opportunities reaching out to residents and workers within the City establishing a community network. Funding is recommended as follows:

**£42,652 for one year to support Do Good, Feel Good: promoting wellness in the City of London funding a full-time programme coach for disadvantaged young people and contributing to support costs for a holistic health club.**

# COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND

**The Lord Mayor's Appeal (ref. 20192)**

**Amount requested: £90,000**

**Amount recommended: £90,000**

**Purpose of grant request: To support the programme [We Can Be] in navigating a challenging external environment with rising running costs and transition to a sustainable future operating model.**

**Type of cost: Revenue**

**Ward(s) benefitting: All**

## **The Applicant**

The Lord Mayor's Appeal (TLMA) is a company limited by guarantee without share capital incorporated in 2012 and governed by a Board of Directors the majority of whom are Aldermen of the City of London plus three Non-Aldermanic Directors. The Lord Mayor of the City of London is the Chair of the Board. TLMA's vision, to create a 'Better City for All', aims to find solutions to the most pressing societal issues in London and beyond. TLMA is uniquely positioned to be able to convene business, experts and not-for-profits to jointly develop initiatives and demonstrate their impact. Its work is structured around four thought leadership programmes. The Power of Inclusion programme helps empower and educate organisations to create inclusive and diverse workplace cultures. This is Me changes attitudes to, and reduces the stigma around, mental health in the workplace. City Giving Day celebrates businesses and employees charitable and volunteering achievements and We Can Be champions inclusivity and social mobility by empowering young people to see the City as a viable career option. TLMA also supports other charities and voluntary bodies through its Annual Appeal and related grant making (2022 partner charities – Duke of Edinburgh's Award, National Numeracy, Place2Be, OnSide and Samaritans).

## **Background and detail of proposal**

We Can Be was borne of the 2016 Girlguiding Girls' Attitudes Survey statistic that said 64% of young women between the ages of 17 and 21 believed that, all being equal, a man would be hired over a woman. Established in 2018 and rebranded in 2023 in response to feedback from participants who identified as non-binary, We Can Be is an annual series of workshops and events that develops the skills and ambitions of young women from disadvantaged backgrounds across London through exposure to other women in the City. The programme capitalises on TLMA's network of contacts and relationships across the City allowing young women to engage with some of the most influential organisations and inspiring role models that other early careers programmes and apprenticeships are not able to leverage. The mutually beneficial programme supports City organisations to access tomorrow's talent, helping to drive the City towards a more diverse and equitable workforce. Typically

each year approximately 250 young women (school year groups 10 and 13) from 22 schools are matched with 21 City businesses. TLMA works directly with schools to select participants who may not see themselves as 'belonging' in the corporate world or who may not have been encouraged to consider such paths. 80% of participants are young people of colour and/or from disadvantaged backgrounds including those receiving free school meals, eligible for Pupil Premium, those in care or a care leaver, young parents and carers, refugees and asylum seekers.

We Can Be is focussed around an all-day event that runs in the Spring term. Participants spend the morning with their host organisations taking part in office tours, meeting women at all levels of the organisation, including those that have taken a less conventional route into their business, and participating in role playing activities to tackling the myths that exist and explore the breadth of roles in a typical City organisation. All participants and hosts come together in the afternoon to network and participate in a panel discussion. Post event, attendees have the opportunity to participate in two further skills workshops and 30-40 young people are offered a year's 1:1 mentoring support currently co-ordinated by the Girls Network.

Since returning to face-to-face delivery post-covid the budget for delivering We Can Be has significantly increased primarily due to the costs of suitable City venue hire. Tapered funding across the next three years is requested to support the continued face-to-face delivery of the programme whilst TLMA grows engagement numbers, earned income and programme sponsorship. Grant funding will enable TLMA to increase and diversify programme participation steadily over five years to 1,000 participants from 50 schools hosted at 50 City businesses with 40 participants offered 1:1 mentoring by 2028.

In line with CILNF recommended good practice for organisations working directly with young people and vulnerable adults, TLMA is currently developing a safeguarding policy, related procedures and undertaking training which is expected to be in place by the New Year.

### **Financial Information**

TLMA generates its income through annual donations from the majority of Livery companies, individual donations, thought leadership programme sponsorship and participation fees, and fundraising events run through its trading subsidiary (TLMA Trading Ltd) which covenants its profits to the charity. Income is variable year on year dependent on fundraising appetite. The We Can Be programme is part funded via sponsorship from LGT Vestra and Evelyn Partners. TLMA's reserves policy is to set aside sufficient unrestricted reserves to enable the wind-down of the charity. This is currently estimated as between £160,000 to £200,000 to which the lower of £25,000 or 1.5% of the net sum raised each year is retained as turnover increases. The free unrestricted reserves in excess of the operational reserve are available for distribution to partner charities. In 2024 We Can Be will relocate to the Guildhall at a discounted rate of £42,400 including audio-visual and catering costs. TLMA will meet the shortfall for the delivery of the programme from its unrestricted reserves until We Can Be becomes self-funding in 2028.

Year end as at November 2022	2022 Signed Accounts £	2023 Projected £	2024 Budget £
<b>Income &amp; expenditure:</b>			
Income	2,154,775	2,676,842	2,065,237
Expenditure	(2,168,895)	(2,526,812)	(2,065,237)
<b>Surplus/(deficit)</b>	<b>(14,120)</b>	<b>150,030</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Reserves:</b>			
Total restricted	0	40,000	40,000
Total unrestricted	1,124,817	1,234,847	1,234,847
<b>Total reserves</b>	<b>1,124,817</b>	<b>1,274,847</b>	<b>1,274,847</b>
Of which: free unrestricted	1,124,817	1,234,847	1,234,847
Reserves policy target	198,644	223,644	248,644
Free reserves over/(under) target	926,173	1,011,203	986,203

### Recommendation

TLMA are uniquely placed to deliver this EDI project providing much needed workplace exposure and pathways to employment for disadvantaged young people. We Can Be has the power to affect real change in the City and create direct benefit for the organisations operating there. By opening up the City to a new pool of talent, whilst simultaneously creating links with influential City organisations, TLMA has the ability to help organisations work towards more diverse, inclusive and equitable workplaces ultimately leading to more future proof organisations and workers. The programme directly delivers two of the City of London's EDI objectives by both enabling career progression and developing workforce that reflects the composition of our communities, and by enabling opportunities for everyone to flourish and reach their full potential regardless of socio-economic background. Funding is recommended as follows:

**£90,000 tapered across three years (Year 1 £40,000; Year 2 £30,000; Year 3 £20,000) to support The Lord Mayor's Appeal in navigating a challenging external environment with rising running costs and transition the We Can Be programme to a sustainable future operating model, subject to the sign off of appropriate safeguarding policy and procedures.**

# 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

<b>Committee(s):</b> Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources) Committee – For decision Policy and Resources Committee – For Decision	<b>Date(s):</b> 30/11/2023  14/12/2023
<b>Subject:</b> Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund – Approval of updated Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Policy	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 10
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Report of:</b> Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Jack Joslin, Head of the Central Grants Unit	

## 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. The process and nature of this engagement is outlined in the City Corporation’s Statement of Community Involvement (May 2023).

A consultation with City communities took place for seven weeks from 6 September to 25 October 2023 to: identify community priorities; assess support for the introduction of three cross-cutting criteria to differentiate between equally strong applications; to consider the introduction of a fallow period of 12 months for applicants who have received five year’s funding; to identify areas for improvement in the processes and management of the CILNF. 207 completed surveys were received. Members are asked to approve several proposed changes to the CILNF Policy in response to comments from City communities and for the programme to adopt this new policy from January 2024.

## Recommendation

Members are recommended to:

1. Note the response and key findings of the consultation on the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund, set out in **Appendix 1**;
2. Approve the proposed community priorities and revised policy for the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund, set out in **Appendix 2**;
3. Subject to the approval of recommendation 2, delegate the approval of funding applications below £100,000 from the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund to the CIL

Neighbourhood Fund Officers Panel and delegate the approval of funding applications for £100,000 and above from the CIL Neighbourhood Fund to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, and

4. Approve the proposed terms of reference for the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund Officers Panel, set out in **Appendix 4**.

## **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. 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. 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 as identified in the neighbourhood plan.
2. 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 Regulations (59C) and 59(F) allows a wider scope of projects to be funded through the CIL Neighbourhood Fund 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).
3. Where there is no existing parish, town or community council, neighbourhood plan or development order, then the local authority will retain neighbourhood CIL funds. 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. The City of London's Statement of Community Involvement (May 2023) section 3.30 sets out how the City Corporation will engage with City communities to understand community priorities for the allocation of monies from the CIL Neighbourhood Fund.

### **Current Position**

5. The City of London CIL came into effect on 1 July 2014. Management of the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF) process is aligned with the City's existing grant allocation process, through the Central Grants Unit. The current City CILNF



Funding Policy is set out at **Appendix 3**. The current neighbourhood portion of the City CIL funding available for distribution as at October 2023 is just over £5.3 million.

<b>Financial year</b>	<b>Funds committed</b>
2020/21	£544,327
2021/22	£2,050,344
2022/23	£3,099,542

6. The City CILNF has been in operation since September 2020, providing a wide range of funding to support City of London Communities. The grant programme is open access and available to apply to throughout the year.
7. Within the City of London, there are no existing parish, town or community councils. There are no adopted neighbourhood plans or neighbourhood development orders. There is one neighbourhood forum – the Barbican & Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum. The Barbican & Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum was designated in July 2023 and is in the process of establishing safe, secure and fit for purpose infrastructure. Given that the City is little over one square mile in area, the City Corporation considers that there are now two neighbourhood areas for the purposes of collection and spending of CIL Neighbourhood Funds. The proposed priorities and policy for the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund will cover all of the square mile whilst the CGU and Planning Teams undertake further work with the Barbican & Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum in relation to how it applies to the Barbican & Golden Lane Neighbourhood Area.

### **Proposals**

8. At the meeting of the Sub-Committee in October, members were informed of the delay to the consultation on the CILNF to avoid the school summer holidays. Consultation took place for seven weeks between 6 September and 25 October 2023. Responses were received from 207 respondents. **Appendix 1** sets out a summary of the community priorities and key issues arising from these representations and suggested amendments to the CILNF policy.
9. Community priorities and key themes arising from the consultation included:
  - a. Very strong support for the introduction of three cross-cutting criteria to inform decision-making between similarly strong proposals: Prioritising proposals that enable everyone to flourish and reach their full potential regardless of their socio-economic background; Prioritising proposals that create a greener City by addressing climate change and managing our environment for this generation and generations to come; Prioritising proposals that ensure community engagement and empowerment in decision making about activities and services offered. These cross-cutting criteria reflect key themes within the City of London’s emerging Corporate Plan and EDI objectives.
  - b. Identification of eight community priorities for the distribution of CIL Neighbourhood funding that closely align with the challenges that City communities are currently facing: Preserve existing and create more green

space in the City including estate gardens and gardening clubs; Prioritise proposals that address the needs of people from disadvantaged backgrounds, minoritised communities, older people, disabled people, LGBTQIA+ people and those living in poverty; Sport, exercise and health activities including promoting walking and cycling; Activities and services for children, young people and families; Making public spaces and services fully accessible for disabled people and the elderly; Projects and activities that have been co-designed by engaging the community in the development of the proposal and/or proposals that demonstrate community support; Mitigate climate change & enhance biodiversity & wildlife; Improve street cleanliness.

- c. Support from City communities for the introduction of a 12-month fallow period before organisations who have received funding for five years can reapply to CILNF to enable new applicants to access to funding.

10. Community suggestions for the improvement of CILNF processes and management identified through consultation included:

- a. Central Grants Unit to actively identify and reach out to potential applicants including grassroot community groups, sole traders, independents and businesses to make sure their needs are met.
- b. Improve awareness of the CILNF through better communications and promotion of successful funded projects.
- c. Ensure greater transparency in relation to decision making and the criteria used to inform decisions.

11. The Central Grants Unit will respond to these suggestions through:

- a. Development and roll-out of a comprehensive communications plan to be implemented in early 2024 to raise awareness of the CILNF and the projects it has funded. This will include encouraging funded applicants to credit and support the wider promotion of their CIL Neighbourhood funded work.
- b. Working through the audience owners who supported the community consultation to map and engage community groups, independent businesses and other potential applicant organisations with the aim of encouraging the development of suitable proposals for CILNF funding.
- c. Updating the CILNF website to provide easy to access information on CILNF criteria and funded projects.

12. Considering the feedback from the consultation Officers have refined the CILNF Policy, to ensure it outlines key community priorities is more accessible for applicants. Members are asked to review the amended policy at **Appendix 2** and approve for it to be implemented from January 2024. **Appendix 3** sets out the current CIL Neighbourhood Fund policy for reference.

13. To ensure that the CILNF can adapt to community needs in a timely matter, Officers are requesting a change in the scheme of delegation for the Neighbourhood Fund.

Members are asked to delegate the approval of funding applications below £100,000 from the City CIL Neighbourhood Fund to the CIL Neighbourhood Fund Officers Panel. All applications between £100,000 and £500,000 will continue to be presented to RASC for decision. An enhanced Terms of Reference for the CILNF Officer Panel is at **Appendix 4** for Approval.

## **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

14. **Corporate Plan Implications:** the CILNF can resource community-led infrastructure improvements and activities across the City and contribute towards meeting the 3 aims of the Corporate Plan 2018-23. The cross-cutting criteria agreed during the consultation reflect key themes within the City of London's emerging Corporate Plan 2024 and EDI objectives.
15. **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.
16. **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.
17. **Equalities and resourcing implications:** the CIL Neighbourhood Fund and proposed revised policy have been subject to a full Equality Analysis. The Equality Analysis has concluded that there are no adverse impacts arising from these proposals for equality groups and social mobility. The CGU has developed an Equalities Action Plan outlining the actions it will take to improve the positive equalities impact of the CILNF.

## **Conclusion**

18. Community Infrastructure Levy legislation requires local authorities to reserve between 15% and 25% of CIL receipts for neighbourhood funding. Where there is no recognised parish or town council or neighbourhood forum, the local authority will retain the neighbourhood fund but must spend it on infrastructure which meets community needs. The local authority must consult the community on how these funds will be used. A Public Consultation has taken place to identify key community priorities between 6 September and 25 October 2023. Members are asked to review the findings of the consultation and agree the new CILNF Policy and scheme of delegations.

## **Appendices**

**Appendix 1** – CILNF 2023 Consultation Key Findings

**Appendix 2** – Proposed City of London Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Policy (Nov 2023)

**Appendix 3** – Current City of London Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Policy (Jul 2022)

## **Appendix 4 – CILNF Officers Panel Terms of Reference (Nov 2023)**

### **Background Papers**

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

#### **Jack Joslin**

Head of Central Grants Unit

E: [jack.joslin@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:jack.joslin@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

## **Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund: 2023 Consultation Key Findings**

### Context

1. Local authorities are required to engage with communities on how CIL neighbourhood funding should be used to support development of the area. The process and nature of this engagement for the City of London is outlined in the City Corporation's Statement of Community Involvement (May 2023) Section 3.30.
2. The CILNF and the CILNF consultation are managed within the City Corporation by the Central Grants Unit. The Central Grants Unit undertakes consultation on community funding priorities to inform changes to the CILNF structure and funding regime. The City's Statement of Community Involvement requires that consultation will take place over a minimum six-week period, with information published on the City Corporation website and information sent to consultees on the City Plan consultee database, plus other interested parties identified by the Central Grants Unit.
3. CGU's previous consultations and updates to the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF) policy were undertaken in May 2019 and Spring 2022.
4. The current consultation sought to engage with City communities to determine their priorities for the CILNF and to seek their views on the introduction of potential cross-cutting criteria as a mechanism to support decision-making of equally strong applications and ensure that the CILNF embedded and delivered the City Corporation's EDI objectives. In anticipation of growing demand for funding, the survey also asked members of the City's communities their views on the potential introduction of a fallow period for applicants who had received five years' continuous funding. The consultation also sought community views on how to improve the delivery of the CILNF and asked about the current challenges communities were facing.

### Structure

5. The 2023 CILNF survey was timed to miss the school summer holidays. The survey was open from 6 September and ran for seven weeks until 25 October 2023.
6. In preparation for initiating improved promotion and outreach for the CILNF in 2024, CGU worked through 73 third-party audience owners to cascade information to residents and City workers through e-newsletters, organisation websites, direct email and social media. In addition the survey was promoted through newspaper advertising alongside a tightly focused poster and leaflet distribution campaign. For communities with no access to the internet hard copy questionnaires in English and Bengali were distributed through community centres and group organisers.

	<b>Audience Owner to cascade/Specific Comms Channel</b>
<b>Reaching individual Residents</b>	
Via CoL Teams/Members	CoL Members Briefing ; City Resident Newsletter; City Plan Consultation Database; Home Newsletter; Golden Lane & Middlesex St Socials; Barbican Bulletin; Golden Lane Community Centre Newsletter; Estate Notice Boards; City Family Arts Network; Guildhall Newsletter; Family Information Service; eShot newsletter; Library Notice Boards; DCCS Internal Newsletter; Family of Schools Newsletter; Golden Lane Community Centre & Portsoken Community Centre notice boards; CoL Corporation social media; CoL website CGU & Consultation pages; Central Grants Unit previous grant applicants (last 3 years)
Via Commissioned Services	Healthwatch; Age UK East London; Carer Connections; Age UK City of London; City Connections; St Luke's Newsletter; Family Action
Via Local Networks & Groups	Portsoken Community Centre Advisory Board; City Parents & Carers Group; Golden Lane Estate Residents Association Newsletter; Middlesex Street Estate Residents Association; Guinness Trust (Mansell Street Estate); Portsoken Gardening Club; Toynbee Art Club (Artisan Library); Forget Me Not Memory Group; Golden Baggers Gardening Club; Hive Curates; Library User Groups; Friends of City Gardens
Via Neighbourhood Forum	Barbican & Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum
Via Grantees	Age UK London; East London Dance; London International Festival of Theatre website; Learning Through the Arts; Imagine Golden Lane; Pollinating London Together; Barbican Communities
<b>Reaching individual Residents/Workers</b>	
Via Religious Groups	PwC Hindu Network; City Hindus; City Sikhs; Bevis Marks Synagogue; St Pauls Cathedral; Dean for the City of London; St Mary Le Bow
Via Commissioned Services	Business Healthy Network; City Advice;
Via Adverts	City Matters; City AM
<b>Reaching individual Workers</b>	
Via CoL Teams	City Network Group; CityHR Network; Small Business Enterprise Centre; CoL Livery Website & Livery Newsletter; City Belonging Project; Destination City Hotels & Attractions
Via BIDs	Eastern City Partnership BID; Primera; Aldgate Connect BID; Cheapside Business Alliance BID; Fleet Street Quarter BID; Culture Mile BID
Via Local Networks	The Heart of the City
Via grantees	Whizz Kidz Sponsor Newsletter; Historic Royal Palaces Sponsor Newsletter

## Response

7. Completed surveys were received from 207 respondents. This represents a 550% increase on the number of respondents compared to the 2022 survey and a 1,200% increase on the number of respondents compared to 2019.
8. 12% of responses were collected as hard copy surveys, 88% of responses were collected through the online survey.
9. Respondents were evenly spread between those that lived and those that worked in the City. 40% of respondents live in the City, 38% of respondents work in the City and 22% of respondents both live and work in the City.

## CIL Neighbourhood Fund Priorities

10. The CILNF funds projects that deliver community benefit and value for money. As the number of good quality applications for funding increases, we need additional criteria to help steer decision making whilst still ensuring that the fund remains responsive to changing community needs.
11. Respondents were asked to score how important they felt three cross-cutting criteria would be in informing the final decision-making between similarly strong proposals: Prioritising proposals that enable everyone to flourish and reach their full potential regardless of their socio-economic background; Prioritising proposals that create a greener City by addressing climate change and managing our environment for this generation and generations to come; Prioritising proposals that ensure community engagement and empowerment in decision making about activities and services offered. These cross-cutting criteria reflect key themes from the City of London's Corporate Plan and the City of London's EDI objectives.
12. 71% of those surveyed strongly agreed or agreed with prioritising proposals that enable everyone to flourish and reach their full potential regardless of their socio-economic background. 16% neither agreed nor disagreed. Only 13% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The 71% who strongly agreed or agreed were comprised of 27% residents, 28% City workers and 15% who were both residents and City workers.
13. 72% of those surveyed strongly agreed or agreed with prioritising proposals that create a greener City by addressing climate change and managing our environment for this generation and generations to come. 11% neither agreed nor disagreed. Only 17% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The 72% who strongly agreed or agreed were comprised of 30% residents, 27% City workers and 14% who were both residents and City workers.
14. 75% of those surveyed strongly agreed or agreed with Prioritising proposals that ensure community engagement and empowerment in decision making about activities and services offered. 15% neither agreed nor disagreed. Only 10% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The 75% who strongly agreed or agreed were comprised of 32% residents, 26% City workers and 17% who were both residents and City workers.

15. There was strong alignment between the views of residents and City workers in support of all three cross-cutting criteria.
16. In addition to the introduction of cross-cutting criteria, respondents were asked to list any other priorities they thought the Neighbourhood Fund should consider when distributing funding.
17. Priorities identified by over 5% or more of respondents were (in descending importance): Preserving existing and creating of more green space in the City including estate gardens and gardening clubs (9%); Prioritise proposals that address the needs of people from disadvantaged backgrounds, minoritised communities, older people, disabled people, LGBTQIA+ people and those living in poverty (7%); Sport, exercise and health activities including promoting walking and cycling (6%); Activities and services for children, young people and families (6%); Making public spaces and services fully accessible for disabled people and the elderly (6%); Prioritise proposals and activities that have been co-designed by engaging the community in the development of the proposal and/or proposals that demonstrate community support (5%); Mitigating climate change & enhancing biodiversity & wildlife (5%); Improving street cleanliness (5%).
18. The eight community identified CILNF priorities closely align with the challenges that respondents reported their communities were facing.
19. The most pressing challenge reported (17% of respondents) was the lack of trees and green space (with seating), poorly maintained green spaces & lack of biodiversity. An important aspect of this issue was the need for additional seating so that these spaces could be enjoyed by workers, residents and the elderly.
20. This challenge is directly addressed within the community identified CILNF priorities and suggested cross-cutting priorities.
21. Significant challenges for communities (in descending order of importance were): High levels of air pollution (14%); Lack of well-maintained playgrounds, sports facilities, pitches and activities for children and young people (13%); Noise pollution from vehicles, construction & late licence bars (12%); Lack of community centres/spaces for people to gather (11%).
22. Other challenges, identified by over 5% or more of respondents, were (in descending importance): Lack of services, activities and day centre for elderly residents (9%); Social isolation, loneliness and lack of community cohesion events and networks (9%); Poor traffic management, congestion, bus re-routing (9%); Overdevelopment and poor planning decisions (9%); Littering, lack of bins & lack of street cleanliness (9%); Antisocial behaviour (8%); Struggling retail especially at weekends (8%); Lack of step-free access, narrow pavements and unsafe uneven pavements causing difficulty for wheelchair users, older people and prams (7%); Cost of living increases including rise in service charges, heating costs and food poverty (7%); Lack of consultation with residents about their needs and how best to deliver them (7%); Dangerous use of bikes & e-scooters including riding and discarding on pavements (6%); Need to bring workers back to the City to work (6%); Closure and lack of local amenities including banks, local shops, family



businesses, difficulty accessing doctors and NHS dentists (6%); Poor maintenance and repair of housing & poor estate management (5%). Many of these issues fall outside of the remit of CILNF but might inform other areas of the City Corporation's work.

#### Eligibility for CIL Neighbourhood Funding

23. Currently organisations can apply for funding for up to five years either as a single grant or a series of grants. To ensure new applicants have access to funding, members of the City's communities were asked how strongly they agreed with the proposal to introduce a 12-month fallow period before organisations who have received continuous funding for five years can reapply.
24. 39% of those surveyed strongly agreed or agreed with the introduction of a 12-month fallow period. 37% neither agreed nor disagreed. 23% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The 39% who strongly agreed or agreed were comprised of 17% residents, 14% City workers and 8% who were both residents and City workers.

#### Suggested improvements to how CILNF operates

25. Respondents to the survey were asked whether they had any suggestions on how the Neighbourhood Fund could improve how it operates. This question only received responses from 52% of respondents with a further 2% stating they had no suggestions. This reflects the fact that many respondents had little or no prior knowledge of CILNF.
26. Suggested improvements identified by over 5% or more of respondents were (in descending importance): Actively identify and reach out to potential applicants including grassroots community groups, sole traders, independents and businesses to make sure their needs are met (14%); Improve awareness of the fund through improved comms and promotion of success stories (11%); Transparency in relation to investment decisions (8%); Provide more information about the CILNF's funding criteria (6%).
27. These suggested improvements will inform and shape our future CILNF comms and engagement work.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Revised City of London Community Infrastructure Levy Policy (Nov 2023)

### Summary of key changes

1. Key changes to the CLINF Policy proposed in response to comments received through community consultation undertaken in September/October 2023 and suggested improvement to CILNF management and processes are:
  - a. Greater clarity has been provided to potential applicants on the scope of infrastructure improvements that can be funded through the Neighbourhood Fund (Clause 10) and the length of provision of maintenance costs (Clause 11).
  - b. Introduction for provision of funding for Access Audits (Clause 12) and the requirement for an access audit and consideration of its findings within all large funded CILNF infrastructure projects (Clause 57) to better embed equalities and inclusion requirements within the fund's criteria.
  - c. Expanded information for applicants to provide a clearer description of the breadth of activities that can be funded through CILNF (Clause 13).
  - d. Diversification of applications through the introduction of a 12-month fallow period for applicants who have received funding for five years (Clauses 16 and 43) to allow new applicants to be funded as demand for CIL Neighbourhood funding increases.
  - e. Alignment of the CILNF Policy with the updated City of London's Statement of Community Involvement approved by Planning and Transportation Committee in May 2023 (Clauses 18 and 22), the designation of the Barbican & Golden Lane Neighbourhood Area, the replacement of Regulation 123 Lists and the government's introduction of Infrastructure Funding Statements (Clause 26).
  - f. Adoption of eight community priorities to guide CILNF decision-making in line with community concerns and to address community identified challenges (Clause 20).
  - g. Introduction of three cross-cutting criteria endorsed by the City's communities to provide a transparent and equitable mechanism for decision-making between equally strong applications that meet community priorities (Clause 21).
  - h. Greater clarity has been provided to reinforce that only infrastructure projects or activity undertaken within the City of London and which benefit City of London communities are eligible for CILNF funding. This revision acknowledges that many organisations delivering activity and projects in the City of London are not necessarily based in the City of London (Clauses 23 and 34).
  - i. Greater transparency has been provided to potential applicants on the assessment of applications through the provision of a comprehensive list of eligibility and assessment criteria (Clauses 30 to 34, Clauses 38 to 40, Clauses 48 to 54 and Clauses 65 and 66).
  - j. Confirmation that grants can be awarded on the condition of receipt of planning and other consents in order to not unnecessarily delay the development of

important projects whilst retaining mechanisms to assure the successful delivery of funded projects (Clause 49).

- k. Clarification that applications for large infrastructure projects in excess of £100,000 should demonstrate how the project will deliver value for money and how this can be evidenced in terms of environmental value, social value as well as financial value (Clauses 55 and 56).
- l. Increase in the minimum level of funding for which applications can be made to £10,000 (Clause 58), in response to the lack of demand for grants of less than £10,000, to ensure that small applications do not lead to disproportionate administrative cost and to provide a natural progression of applicants from the Stronger Communities Fund (applications to £10,000) to the CILNF (applications from £10,000 to £500,000).
- m. Confirmation that the maximum level of funding for which applications can be made is £500,000 (Clause 59), removing any ambiguity about the maximum level of request.
- n. Introduction of a maximum total level of any grant/s awarded or consecutive grants awarded to the same applicant organisation of £500,000 within any five year period to ensure wide distribution of CIL neighbourhood funding to a diverse range of grassroot, small and well-established organisations (Clause 60).
- o. In line with Members' request, increase to the thresholds for delegated authority to align with those already used by City Bridge Foundation, providing for delegated authority to determine a proportion of applications, whilst retaining the requirement for Committee approval for larger value applications (Clauses 62 to 64):
  - i. Applications under £100,000 – to be determined by officer delegation.
  - ii. Applications for £100,000 and over – determined by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, with advice from the CILNF Officers Panel.
- p. Greater accountability has been provided through the inclusion of a comprehensive complaints procedure for applicants (Clause 67).

Draft as at 1 November 2023

# City of London

## Community Infrastructure Levy

### Neighbourhood Fund Policy



## **Index**

## **Page**

CIL introduction and legislative background

CIL Neighbourhood Fund Requirements

Community Definition

What can the City of London's CIL Neighbourhood Fund be used for?

Community Priorities

Governance Process

Application Process

Eligibility Criteria

Application Advice

Assessment Criteria

Value of Bids

Awards Process

Complaints Process

# City of London Community Infrastructure Levy

## Neighbourhood Fund Policy

### CIL 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 of London's CIL is available on the City Corporation's website at <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/services/planning/planning-policy/community-infrastructure-levy-cil-and-planning-obligations-s106>

### 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 as identified in the neighbourhood plan.
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. There is one neighbourhood forum – the Barbican & Golden Lane Neighbourhood Forum. There are no adopted neighbourhood plans or neighbourhood development orders. Given that the City is little over one square mile in area, the City Corporation

considers that it should be regarded as two neighbourhoods for the purposes of collection and spending of CIL Neighbourhood Funds. The City Corporation therefore retains the CIL Neighbourhood Fund and should seek community views on how this Fund should be used.

## **Community Definition**

7. The City of London has a resident population of approximately 8,000 and a daily working population of approximately 513,000 occupying nearly 9 million square metres of office floorspace. For the purposes of the CIL Neighbourhood Fund, 'community' is defined as local residents, City workers and the owners and occupiers of City buildings.

## **What can the City of London's CIL Neighbourhood Fund be used for?**

8. CIL Regulations 59(C) and 59(F) require 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.
9. 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.
10. For the purposes of the CIL Neighbourhood Fund the City Corporation considers infrastructure to include the construction, refurbishment, repair, restoration, repurposing, expansion or fit out of new or existing buildings or open space; lighting; public art; street furniture or other physical improvement that enhances the neighbourhood for the benefit of City of London communities.
11. The CIL Neighbourhood Fund can also fund the reasonable on-going maintenance costs of funded infrastructure improvements for up to a maximum of three years from the completion of the infrastructure provided that the maximum grant award of £500,000 is not exceeded and that the maximum five year length of grant award is not exceeded.



12. The CIL Neighbourhood Fund can fund the costs of an Access Audit prior to a subsequent application for infrastructure improvements.
13. 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 and activities including events, workshops, celebrations, projects or anything else that addresses the impact of development on the neighbourhood.
14. 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.
15. Projects should be delivered within the agreed timescale (maximum 5 years from the date of grant awarded) unless a grant extension is agreed.
16. 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 to provide funding for up to a maximum of 5 years from the date of the initial grant awarded. Applicants in receipt of 5 years of funding will not be eligible to reapply for CIL Neighbourhood Funding for a period of 12 months. 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.

## **Community Priorities**

17. The City of London's Statement of Community Involvement May 2023 as approved by the Planning and Transportation Committee sets out how the City Corporation will engage with City communities to ensure that consultations are effective, inclusive and open and accessible for everyone.
18. The Statement of Community Involvement (May 2023) section 3.30 states that public consultation should be carried out on a regular basis a The CIL Neighbourhood Fund and consultation are managed within the City Corporation by the Central Grants Unit. The Central Grants Unit should undertake occasional consultation on community funding priorities to

inform changes to the CIL Neighbourhood Fund structure and funding regime. This consultation will take place over a minimum six-week period, with information published on the City Corporation website and information sent to consultees on the City Plan consultee database, plus other interested parties identified by the Central Grants Unit.

19. The City Corporation community consultation on priorities for the use of the City's CIL Neighbourhood Fund undertaken in 2019 identified support for the Fund to be used primarily to deliver infrastructure and services that meet local community identified needs.

20. Community consultation on priorities for the use of the City's CIL Neighbourhood Fund undertaken in 2023 identified support for the Fund to be use for the following priorities and identified needs:

- a) Preserving existing and creating of more green space in the City including estate gardens and support for gardening clubs.
- b) Addressing the needs of people from disadvantaged backgrounds, minoritised communities, older people, disabled people, LGBTQIA+ people and those living in poverty.
- c) Sporting, exercise and health activities including promoting walking and cycling.
- d) Activities and services for children, young people and families.
- e) Making public spaces and services fully accessible for disabled people and the elderly.
- f) Proposals and activities that have been co-designed by engaging the community in the development of the proposal and/or proposals that demonstrate community support.
- g) Mitigating climate change & enhancing biodiversity & wildlife.
- h) Improving street cleanliness.

**21.** When there are too many strong applications for the Neighbourhood Funds available, determination of applications will consider the extent to which the application meets one or more of the following cross-cutting criteria:

- a. Proposals that enable everyone to flourish and reach their future potential regardless of their socio-economic background.

- b. Proposals that create a greener City by addressing climate change and managing our environment for this generation and generations to come.
  - c. Proposals that ensure community engagement and empowerment in decision making about activities and services offered.
22. A full review of the Neighbourhood Fund, including priorities and governance, will be undertaken at least every 5 years.

## **Governance Process**

23. The City Corporation's CIL Neighbourhood Fund will be allocated following the assessment of eligible applications that meet the assessment criteria for infrastructure projects or activities that take place within the City of London and which benefit City of London communities.
24. The determination of these applications will rest with the City Corporation.
25. The City Corporation will publish details of funded applications on the City Corporation's website at: [CIL Neighbourhood Approved Grants](#).
26. 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.

## **Application Process**

27. 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/about-us/working-with-community/community-infrastructure-levy-neighbourhood-fund>

28. 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 at:  
<https://citycorporationgrants.my.site.com/fundingprograms/s/funding-program/a028d00000Bp70V/cil-neighbourhood-fund>

## **Eligibility Criteria**

29. CIL Neighbourhood Fund applications will be accepted from the following types of organisation:
- Constituted voluntary organisations and resident associations
  - Constituted business organisations and associations
  - UK Registered charities
  - Registered community interest companies (CIC)
  - Charitable companies (incorporated as not for profit)
  - Registered charitable incorporated organisations
  - Exempt or excepted charities
  - Registered charitable industrial and provident society (IPS) or charitable community benefit society (BenCom).
30. Applicant organisations should have a clear set of governing rules and governing document appropriate to their legal status.
31. Applicant organisations should have a minimum of three unrelated members on their governing body.
32. Applicant organisations are required to provide at least one year's signed, audited or independently examined accounts for the organisation.
33. Applicants should have robust financial procedures in place to ensure that funds are used appropriately. The applicant must have an ordinary business bank account and all cheques from the bank account must be signed by at least two individual representatives of the organisation who are not related to one another and who do not live at the same address.
34. Applications must be for infrastructure or activities that benefit City of London communities and take place within the City of London. Applications should demonstrate City-based support.

35. 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.
36. Applications will not be accepted from political parties or organisations involved in political lobbying.
37. 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.
38. Applicant organisations should have a safeguarding policy that ensures the organisation provides a safe and trusted environment which safeguards anyone who comes into contact with it, including beneficiaries, staff and volunteers. Application organisations seeking funding for activities with or for young people and vulnerable adults must have a robust safeguarding policy in place which outlines procedures, training, incident reporting and safeguarding risks.
39. Applicants in receipt of a rejected application cannot reapply to CIL Neighbourhood Fund for 12 months from the submission date of the rejected application.
40. Applicants may have no more than one active CIL Neighbourhood grant at any time.
41. Applications for infrastructure funding to mitigate the direct impacts of specific development will not be accepted. Such mitigation should be delivered as part of the development process and funded through s106 Planning Obligations.
42. Applications to fund projects which are already in receipt of other City CIL funding, s106, or s278 funding for site specific mitigation will not normally be accepted.
43. Applicant organisations who have received five year's funding will be subject to a fallow period of 12 months before they can reapply for CIL Neighbourhood Funding. The start of funding will be measured from the date of first grant awarded. Continuous funding will be considered as funding in each of the five calendar years from the date of grant awarded irrespective of short gaps between the allocation of

continuation grants. The 12 month fallow period will be measured from the date of approval of the applicant's Year Five Information & Learning End of Project report.

## **Application Advice**

44. The Central Grants Unit provides pre-application advice and support to applicants. The Central Grants Unit will also provide feedback to unsuccessful applicants. Requests for advice should be emailed to [grants@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:grants@cityoflondon.gov.uk)
45. The Central Grants Unit cannot provide assistance with project management or delivery of schemes funded through the Neighbourhood Fund.

## **Assessment Criteria**

46. 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:
  - d. 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.
47. Applications should evidence of the feasibility, deliverability and sustainability of the project.
48. Applications should set out clear timescales for delivery.
49. Applications for infrastructure projects should have obtained all necessary planning and other consents prior to the release of funding.
50. Applications should not include expenditure for any spending commitments made before the date of grant awarded.
51. Applicants should not apply to CLINF for any part of a project that is already funded.
52. Applications that include a request for funding towards a post where the post holder will work more than 17.5 hours per week must submit a job description to outline the key roles and responsibilities of the post, the hours, the pay rate/salary.

53. We are a Living Wage Friendly Funder. Any post paid for in full or part by a grant must be paid the London Living Wage as a minimum.
54. Applications for funding to support infrastructure and projects should specify the activities (outputs) that will be delivered and the differences (outcomes) that will be achieved as a result of delivering the project. Applicants should submit a monitoring framework with measurable targets that sets out how the organisation will track progress against intended outputs and outcomes.
55. Applications for funding in excess of £100,000 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.
56. Applications for infrastructure projects in excess of £100,000 should seek three quotes for all elements of intended work/materials over the value of £10,000. Submission of original quotes may be requested during the assessment process. Applicants should indicate which quote they consider represents best value for money. When assessing value for money the City Corporation will consider environmental value, social value as well as financial value.
57. Applications for the realisation of infrastructure projects of £100,000 or more should usually evidence that an access audit has been undertaken in relation to the proposed project and that its recommendations have informed the submitted proposal.

## **Value of Bids**

58. The minimum value for applications to the CIL Neighbourhood Fund is £10,000. Applicants seeking smaller grants should consider applying to the City Corporation's Stronger Communities Fund:  
<https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/about-us/working-with-community/central-grants-programme/stronger-communities>
59. The maximum grant awarded from the CIL Neighbourhood Fund is £500,000.
60. The total value of any grant/s awarded or consecutive grants awarded to the same applicant organisation cannot exceed £500,000 within any 5 year (60 month) period measured from the date of grant awarded of the initial grant to the applicant organisation.

## Awards Process

61. The determination of applications will be made through a combination of officer delegation and Committee approval, depending on the financial value of the application.
62. Funding applications for under £100,000 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.
63. Decisions taken under delegated authority will be reported to the Resource Allocations Sub-Committee.
64. Applications for £100,000 and over 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. Decisions should normally be made within 6 months from the receipt of a valid application.
65. Where a grant has been awarded for revenue expenditure, applicants have up to one year from the date of the grant letter in which to begin to draw down funds. Where a grant has been awarded for capital expenditure, applicants have up to two years from the date of the grant offer letter in which to draw down funds. The grant offer may be revoked where the grant is not drawn down as outlined above unless an alternative timescale has been agreed in writing. 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.
66. Applicants who withdraw their application during the assessment process may reapply to the CIL Neighbourhood Fund at any time.

## Complaints Process

67. Any applicant wishing to complain or express dissatisfaction about the conduct, standard of service, actions or lack of action by the Central Grants Unit during the assessment of their application should follow the City of London's simple three-stage procedure outlined on the Corporation's website at: [Feedback - City of London](#). At Stage 1 complainants should contact [grants@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:grants@cityoflondon.gov.uk) upon which their complaint review will be undertaken by the Head of Central Grants Unit. A full response should be provided within ten working days. At Stage 2 a complaint review will be undertaken by the Chief Officer of the Department or a nominated Senior Officer (Chair of CILNF Officer



Panel). A full response should be provided within ten working days or the complainant will be advised of any delay At Stage 3 complainants should contact [complaints@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:complaints@cityoflondon.gov.uk) upon which a complaint review will be undertaken by the Town Clerk & Chief Executive or a Senior Officer acting on his/her behalf. A full response should be provided within ten working days or the complainant will be advised of any delay.

This page is intentionally left blank

# 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

**Terms of Reference for the City of London Corporation  
Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Officer Panel**

**1. Purpose**

**The Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund Officer Panel (CILNFOP) is an officer body, with responsibility for discussing and directing matters relevant to the policy, management and allocation of the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF), and communicating issues or making CILNF grant recommendations for the consideration of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee (RASC) or Members, as required.**

The CILNFOP will:

1. Provide a forum for a cross-departmental group of Officers to:
  - 1.1 Comply with Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and all subsequent amendments in relation to the purpose and administration of CIL Neighbourhood Funds;
  - 1.2 Establish, review and oversee the ongoing implementation of CILNF policy in line with evolving grant making good practice and local community need;
  - 1.3 Regularly monitor and review the value of CILNF available for distribution to ensure the value of grants awarded does not outstrip the level of funds available;
  - 1.4 Discuss detailed grant application assessments in relation to CILNF priorities and make recommendations for CILNF application rejection or funding for the consideration of RASC or Members, as required;
  - 1.5 Under delegated authority to determine CILNF funding applications for applications under £100,000;
  - 1.6 To report on decisions taken under delegated authority to the RASC;
  - 1.7 To engage with communities where development has taken place and seek community views to determine priorities and how the CILNF should be used;
  - 1.8 To undertake a full review of the CILNF, including priorities and governance, at least every 5 years;
  - 1.9 To engage with Neighbourhood Forums established within the City of London;

- 1.10 To approve an annual report for the CILNF to include details of the total CILNF receipts in the reporting year; total CILNF expenditure in the reporting year; details of CILNF expenditure for the reporting year, including the amount spent on each individual project; total CILNF monies remaining.

## 2. Constitution and Membership

- 2.1 The CILNFOP is made up of Officers drawn from across City Corporation Departments selected on the basis of their skills, knowledge and experience in order to ensure that the CILNFOP has an appropriate balance and breadth of skills, knowledge and experience necessary to deliver CILNF policy, priorities and related grant-making recommendations.

### 2.2 Membership

Name	Job Title
Rob McNicol (Chair)	Assistant Director for Policy and Strategy – Built Environment
Tom Noble	Group Manager (Business Development & Development Management) – Built Environment
Melanie Charalambous	Policy and Projects – Built Environment
Ellie Ward	Head of Strategy & Performance – Community & Children's Services
Claire Callan-Day	Environmental Health Technician – Built Environment
Simon Owen	Head of Finance – Financial Services
Micah Mclean	Equalities, Diversity & Inclusion Officer
Laurie Miller-Zutshi	Head of Offer – Cultural & Visitor Development
Jake Tibbetts	City Gardens Manager
Rachel Levy	Head of Barbican and Community Libraries

- 2.3 Other relevant Officers, or external experts, will be invited to the meeting as and when required.
- 2.4 The Chair of the CILNFOP will be the Assistant Director, Policy and Strategy, Built Environment in line with the authority delegated to the role outlined in the Corporation of London's Scheme of Delegations to Officers Section D6.

## 3. Quorum

A quorum for the CILNFOP is three Officers.

## 4. Meetings and Decisions

- 4.1 CILNFOP meetings will be chaired by the CILNFOP Chair, but if s/he is not present Officers present can nominate an Officer to chair the meeting;
- 4.2 Any vote at a meeting shall be decided by a show of hands;

- 4.3 In a split vote the Chair will have the casting vote;
- 4.4 Where matters require wider consideration or escalation, the CILNFOP can provide memoranda, including any recommendation, to other Strategic Officer groups (as relevant to their terms of reference);
- 4.5 Where matters require Member consultation or formal decisions, the CILNFOP can report into the Chair and Deputy Chair of the RASC;
- 4.6 Where a grant recommendation or decision under delegated authority is required urgently and falls outside the timetable of CILNFOP meetings, Officers can vote on application assessments or issues for decision circulated via email between meetings indicating their recommendation to the Chair within 3 working days.

## **5. Declaration of interests**

At the start of each meeting Officers must declare:

- 5.1 The nature and extent of any interest, direct or indirect, which they have in relation to a potential funded organisation and/or grant request;
- 5.2 Withdraw from the meeting for that item after providing any information requested by the Chair and other Officers;
- 5.3 Not be counted in the quorum for that part of the meeting;
- 5.4 Have no vote on the matter.

## **6. Meeting duration and timings**

Meetings will take place in person and/or remotely approximately every month and shall aim to last no more than 90 minutes. The frequency of meetings will be reviewed at appropriate intervals. When there are no application assessments for review in any given month the meeting will be cancelled.

## **7. Documentation**

Agendas, assessment reports and any additional documentation, will be produced and circulated to the group five working days in advance of each meeting by the Central Grants Unit. Minutes will be captured at each meeting and circulated between meetings by the Central Grants Unit.

## **8. Review of Terms of Reference**

The CILNF's terms of reference shall be reviewed at least annually and in light of any recommendations made or similar bodies established.

Agreed by CILNF Officers Panel: 8 November 2023  
Review date: 8 November 2024





# Agenda Item 7

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

<p><b>Committees:</b> RASC – For Decision Policy and Resources Committee – For Decision</p>	<p><b>Dates:</b> 30 November 2023 21 September 2023</p>
<p><b>Subject:</b> BEMS Upgrade Programme – Phase 2</p> <p><b>Unique Project Identifier:</b> PV ID 12331</p>	<p><b>Gateway 3/4/5:</b> <b>Options Appraisal and Authority to Start Work (Regular)</b></p>
<p><b>Report of:</b> City Surveyor</p> <p><b>Report Author:</b> Brendan Crowley</p>	<p><b>For Decision</b></p>

<p><b>1. Status update</b></p>	<p><b>Project Description:</b> This is the second phase of the upgrade of the corporate Building Energy Management System (BEMS). This involves the replacement of critical end-of-life components for core services – heating cooling and ventilation and life-safety systems. The BEMS upgrades of the below sites support the Climate Action Strategy (CAS) by providing the backbone for a Smart Buildings network and will be an essential tool to control and monitor the City’s buildings into the future – allowing us to quantify the effects of the many carbon reduction projects planned as part of the CAS. This is also business resilience project not a direct energy efficiency project. The BEMS on the following sites are to be migrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The View – Epping Forest</li> <li>• The Temple – Wanstead Park</li> <li>• The Warren - Epping Forest</li> <li>• Harrow Road Pavilion - Wanstead Park</li> <li>• Heathrow Animal Reception Centre (HARC)</li> </ul> <p><b>RAG Status:</b> Amber (Amber at last report to Committee)</p> <p><b>Risk Status:</b> Medium (Medium at last report to committee)</p> <p><b>Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> <b>£200,424</b></p> <p><b>Change in Total Estimated Cost of Project (excluding risk):</b> decrease of 16,967 since last report to Committee.</p>
--------------------------------	---

*This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.*

	<p><b>Spend to Date:</b> £0 £35k was requested at GW2 but not used however as all design work/spec was done in house, and the contractor carried out the surveys at zero cost.</p> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision Utilised: £0</b></p> <p><b>Slippage:</b> Short delay due to Capital Review. Revised completion date – December 2023</p>
<p><b>2. Next steps and requested decisions</b></p>	<p><b>Next Gateway:</b> Gateway 6: Outcome Report</p> <p>Note: that central funding has been agreed in principle and will therefore require further approval of RASC to draw down the funds.</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b></p> <p>Appoint Consultant &amp; principal Contractor via Minor Works Framework and programme the works on each site with the BEMS Specialist.</p> <p><b>Requested Decisions:</b></p> <p><i>Please populate the financial information as structured below. Set out any decisions needed for this paper, if the paper is going to multiple committees note which decisions apply to which committee. Town Clerks Committee Clerks can assist you with committee terms of reference. CRP is not mandatory but can be requested if deemed necessary for projects where the G2 was approved post April 2019.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That additional budget of <b>£200,424</b> is approved to reach the next Gateway;</li> <li>2. Note the revised project budget of <b>£200,424</b> (excluding risk);</li> <li>3. Note the total estimated cost of the project at <b>£200,424</b> (excluding risk);</li> <li>4. That a Costed Risk Provision of <b>£47,486</b> is approved (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer), as per risk register appendix 2.</li> </ol> <p>That Option <b>2</b> is approved.</p> <p>Option 2: Migration of BEMS legacy systems to Ecostruxure platform at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The View – Epping Forest</li> <li>• The Temple</li> <li>• The Warren - Epping Forest</li> <li>• Harrow Road Pavilion</li> <li>• HARC)</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Budget</b></p>	<p>Total cost of the project – <b>£200,424</b></p> <p>This is slight reduction in previous estimates due to more accurate costings from suppliers.</p> <p>Please see appendix 1 for individual site migration cost breakdown.</p> <p>CRP of <b>£47,486</b> is requested.</p> <p>Capital expenditure is expected in Q2/3 in financial year 2023/24</p>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

	<p><i>For recommended option 1:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="528 342 1390 853"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="528 342 762 445">Item</th> <th data-bbox="762 342 1007 445">Reason</th> <th data-bbox="1007 342 1230 445">Funds/Source of Funding</th> <th data-bbox="1230 342 1390 445">Cost (£)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="528 445 762 658">1</td> <td data-bbox="762 445 1007 658">Legacy BEMS hardware and software is obsolete and prone to failure</td> <td data-bbox="1007 445 1230 658">City Cash Reserves 56%. City Fund Reserves 44%</td> <td data-bbox="1230 445 1390 658"><b>£200,424</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="528 658 762 853"><b>Total</b></td> <td data-bbox="762 658 1007 853">From City Fund Reserves From City Cash Reserves</td> <td data-bbox="1007 658 1230 853">£112,237 £88,187</td> <td data-bbox="1230 658 1390 853"><b>£200,424</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Costed Risk Provision requested for this Gateway:</b> <b>£47,486</b> (as detailed in the Risk Register – Appendix 2). This funded from the Capital funding agreed in principle at GW2. (Same 56%/44% CC/CF split applies)</p>	Item	Reason	Funds/Source of Funding	Cost (£)	1	Legacy BEMS hardware and software is obsolete and prone to failure	City Cash Reserves 56%. City Fund Reserves 44%	<b>£200,424</b>	<b>Total</b>	From City Fund Reserves From City Cash Reserves	£112,237 £88,187	<b>£200,424</b>
Item	Reason	Funds/Source of Funding	Cost (£)										
1	Legacy BEMS hardware and software is obsolete and prone to failure	City Cash Reserves 56%. City Fund Reserves 44%	<b>£200,424</b>										
<b>Total</b>	From City Fund Reserves From City Cash Reserves	£112,237 £88,187	<b>£200,424</b>										
<p><b>4. Overview of project options</b></p>	<p>There are two options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do nothing – leave legacy system in place and risk failure and server impact on business continuity and increased Energy and carbon bills.</li> <li>2. Migration the BEMS on each site to the latest Schneider platform – EcoStruxure in line with the rest of the City’s operation buildings</li> </ol> <p>Note: only one option available as these sites must be compatible with wider City BEMS system therefore they must Ecostruxure.</p>												
<p><b>5. Recommended option</b></p>	<p>Option 2 is recommended – this will future proof these sites for business continuity and energy efficient – an essential enabler to support further Climate Action Strategy projects for these sites.</p>												
<p><b>6. Risk</b></p>	<p>R1: Presence of asbestos containing material which requires management prior to works being undertaken.</p> <p>R2: Unforeseen Issues with Fire systems.</p> <p>R3: Extra Out of hours working required.</p> <p>R7: Installation is not compliant.</p> <p>R9: Installed assets fail before anticipated life.</p> <p>R12: Delay in providing/recruiting Project Manager to manage the process following GW3/4/5 approval.</p>												

*This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.*

	Further information available in the Risk Register (Appendix 2) and options appraisal matrix.
<b>7. Procurement approach</b>	<p><i>For recommended option (add procurement reference no.)</i>  <i>Refer to the PT4 as needed</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Direct award to Sykes &amp; son Ltd. through minor works (MTC) framework to deliver all 5no. sites migration works.</li> <li>2. Specialist BEMS contractors to install the new system on each site.</li> <li>3. Direct award to Project Management service to Beveridge Associates (sub £10k contract)</li> </ol>
<b>8. Design summary</b>	<p>General design and project executing steps to be carried on all 5no. sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. BEMS specialist contractor to carry out site control panel condition survey ahead of migration works.</li> <li>2. Extend Enterprise Server licensing as needed for the required EcoStruxure controller and take a backup of the Continuum net controllers.</li> <li>3. Decommission and replace the Net-Controller II and input/output modules with an EcoStruxure AS-P Automation Server and input/output modules. Connect the AS-P to the existing local CoL IT network Ethernet data point.</li> <li>4. Where an ininet sub-network existing install IP ethernet network to support EcoStruxure RPC IP sub controllers.</li> <li>5. Strip out the redundant Power/BMS panel, original power and BMS containment and wiring.</li> <li>6. Replace all existing input devise (sensors/switches) with new parts.</li> <li>7. At Epping Forest The View install additional space temperature and humidity sensors to improve the control of the space conditions.</li> <li>8. At HARC strip out all i2 controllers serving redundant animal enclosure heating.</li> </ol>
<b>9. Delivery team</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project will be managed by the Minor Works Team (City Surveyors). Client-side Project Manager will be Beveridge Associates Ltd.</li> <li>2. Contract for the works will via the Measured Terms Contract– Sykes &amp; Sons Ltd.</li> <li>3. BEMS specialist has already been engaged to propose solutions and costs.</li> </ol>
<b>10. Success criteria</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Successful installation and commissioning of new EcoStruxure BEMS hardware and Software.</li> <li>2. Improved system reliability and future proofing business as usual operation of these key corporation sites and through installation modern building controls.</li> <li>3. Reduced building energy consumption &amp; carbon emissions due to optimised building control.</li> <li>4. Enhanced user experience through interactive graphics, trend data presentation and alarm management facilities.</li> <li>5. Integration of the new BEMS system with 3rd party systems on site, and with the Enterprise server at Guildhall. As well potential for addition to Building Analytics software package being procured via the PSDS. Programme in 2022.</li> </ol>

*This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.*

<b>11. Progress reporting</b>	<i>Progress report will be provided to the senior responsible officer and the City Surveyor on a regular basis. Project Vision will be updated monthly, and issue reports will return to committee as necessary.</i>
-------------------------------	--

### **Appendices**

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Project Coversheet
<b>Appendix 2</b>	Risk Register
<b>Appendix 3</b>	Additional Info

### **Contact**

<b>Report Author</b>	Brendan Crowley
<b>Email Address</b>	brendan.crowley@cityoflondon.gov.uk
<b>Telephone Number</b>	07395600031

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

**Options Appraisal Matrix**

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>
<b>1. Brief description of option</b>	Do nothing approach.	Migration of BEMS legacy systems to Ecostruxure platform at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The View – Epping Forest</li> <li>• The Temple</li> <li>• The Warren - Epping Forest</li> <li>• Harrow Road Pavilion</li> <li>• HARC</li> </ul>
<b>2. Scope and exclusions</b>	No Capital funding investment required with the decision not to install new BEMS platforms.	Full migration of BEMS at the 5no. sites funded by a combination of City Fund and City's Cash.
<b>Project Planning</b>		
<b>3. Programme and key dates</b>	n/a	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Secure project approval - May 2023</li> <li>2. Procure PM services May 2023</li> <li>3. Procure principal contractor services from preferred supplier via</li> </ol>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>
		<p>minor works framework - May 2023</p> <p>4. Engage with site stakeholders at 5no. sites to plan the phasing of the works – June 2023</p> <p>5. Place order with Contractor June 2023</p> <p>6. Start on site August 2023*</p> <p>7. Practical completion of works on all 5no. sites Dec '23</p> <p>8. System handover Jan'24.</p> <p>9. Gateway 6 report 6 months after project completion</p> <p>*Schneider Electric are currently quoting 2 - 3 months lead time on some of their equipment.</p>
<b>4. Risk implications</b>	n/a	<i>R1:</i> Presence of asbestos containing material which

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>
		<p>requires management prior to works being undertaken.</p> <p>R2: Unforeseen Issues with Fire systems</p> <p>R3: Extra Out of hours working required.</p> <p>R7: Installation is not compliant.</p> <p>R9: Installed assets fail before anticipated life.</p> <p>R12: Delay in providing/recruiting Project Manager to manage the process following GW3/4/5 approval.</p>
<p><b>5. Stakeholders and consultees</b></p>	<p>Carbon Action Strategy not supported by not utilising latest Building control technology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keiron Siddons - HARC</li> <li>• Ross Hayes - HARC</li> <li>• Lee Powell</li> <li>• Nick Clayden</li> <li>• Jess Lees</li> </ul>



This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andrew Coke</li> <li>• David Clelland – IT</li> <li>• Johnathon Cooper – City Surveyors</li> <li>• Carmel McGowan – City Surveyors</li> <li>• Graeme Low – City Surveyors</li> <li>• Kayleigh Rippe – City Procurement</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Benefits of option</b></p>	<p>None</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitigate risk of system failure and impact on business continuity, through removal of all obsolete legacy BEMS hardware and software.</li> <li>2. Improved system reliability and ensuring business-as-usual for these key corporation sites and through installation of a modern building controls platform.</li> <li>3. Enhanced user experience through interactive graphics, trend data</li> </ol>

<b>Option Summary</b>	Option 1	<b>Option 2</b>
		<p>presentation and alarm management facilities.</p> <p>4. Support for the Carbon Action Strategy through improved plant optimisation and reduction in energy consumption and carbon emissions.</p> <p>5. Integration of the new BEMS system with 3rd party systems on site, and with the Enterprise Server at Guildhall. As well as the new Building Analytics software package being procured via the PSDS programme.</p>
<p><b>7. Disbenefits of option</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No potential energy/carbon savings delivered</li> <li>• Carbon Action Strategy not supported</li> <li>• Increased risk of system failure and impact on business continuity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement for additional Project Management resource from City Surveyors to oversee project.</li> </ul>
<b>Resource Implications</b>	None	

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>
<b>8. Total estimated cost</b>	0	<b>£200,424.</b>
<b>9. Funding strategy</b>	n/a	1. City's cash = £111,455 2. City fund = £88,968  CRP: 1. City's cash = £25,476 2. City fund = £22,009
<b>10. Investment appraisal</b>	n/a	The Energy Team have carried out assessment of the ROI based on the savings delivered by option 2 (a & b) compared to no associated saving with option 1. This ROI is modest as this is not an energy efficiency project. It is, however, an essential business continuity project to replaced failing equipment.
<b>11. Estimated capital value/return</b>	n/a	The project is estimated to deliver savings of £15,758/ann.

*This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.*

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>
		in maintenance and energy costs.
<b>12. Ongoing revenue implications</b>	n/a	There is no additional on-going revenue implications for the new equipment as it is like for like replacement of assets already maintained as part of the City Operation and Maintenance Contract. In addition, the project is estimated to deliver savings of £15,758/ann. in maintenance and energy costs.
<b>13. Affordability</b>	n/a	Option is covered under the allocated and approved Capital funding budgets.
<b>14. Legal implications</b>	n/a	n/a
<b>15. Corporate property implications</b>	none	Consultation required with City Surveyors Corporate Property Team to ensure new equipment captured in the asset register for each site, replacing of existing legacy assets.

*This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.*

<b>Option Summary</b>	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>
<b>16. Traffic implications</b>	n/a	None
<b>17. Sustainability and energy implications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No potential energy/carbon savings delivered</li> <li>• Carbon Action Strategy not supported</li> </ul>	Project is being developed by the Corporate Energy team to deliver energy and carbon savings in line with the Climate Action Strategy
<b>18. IS implications</b>	n/a	Opportunity Outline submitted to IT PMO for survey to any IT network extension requirements associated with the project. IT have provided network architect support.
<b>19. Equality Impact Assessment</b>	n/a	None
<b>20. Data Protection Impact Assessment</b>	n/a	None
<b>21. Recommendation</b>	Not recommended	Recommended

This page is intentionally left blank

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

# Project Coversheet

<b>[1] Ownership &amp; Status</b>
<p><b>UPI: 12268</b></p> <p><b>Core Project Name:</b> BEMS Upgrade Programme - Phase 2,  <b>Programme Affiliation (if applicable):</b> N/A  <b>Project Manager:</b> Brendan Crowley</p> <p><b>Definition of need:</b> The Current BEMS platform is obsolete, end-of-life &amp; increasingly unreliable. We intend to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitigate the Life Safety Risk posed by the failure of the obsolete system which monitors &amp;, in some cases, controls the fire &amp; smoke emergency plant with the installation a new, fit-for-purpose BEMS.</li> <li>2. Mitigate this significant business risk to the Corporation with the upgrade of the system the latest BEMS platform, Schnieder EcoStruxure.</li> <li>3. Invest in a modern, flexible &amp; easily optimised control system for the CPG estate building assets. Bringing with it improved building energy performance and, as such, supporting the Carbon Action Strategy.</li> <li>4. Use the new BEMS as a platform to implement further innovative smart building technologies and to allow for integration with other systems e.g. CAFM software, energy management software and lighting controls.</li> </ol> <p><b>Key measures of success:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have a fully reliable, resilient BEMS which meets customer needs at the five phase 2 sites: The View – Epping Forest, The Temple – Wanstead Park, The Warren - Epping Forest, Harrow Road Pavilion - Wanstead Park &amp; Heathrow Animal Reception Centre (HARC)</li> <li>2. Have building assets that are optimised to operate as efficiently as possible via a new BEMS platform and via integration with energy management software, resulting in energy consumption savings.</li> </ol> <p><b>Expected timeframe for the project delivery:</b></p> <p>Original range:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower Range estimate: 1/5/2023</li> <li>• Upper Range estimate: 1/11/2023</li> </ul> <p>Revised range:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower Range estimate: 1/010/2023</li> <li>• Upper Range estimate: 31/3/2024</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Milestones:</b></p> <p>Are we on track for completing the project against the expected timeframe for project delivery? yes          Has this project generated public or media impact and response which the City of London has needed to manage or is managing? No</p>

<b>[2] Finance and Costed Risk</b>
<p><b>Headline Financial, Scope and Design Changes:</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p><b>'Project Briefing' G1 report (as approved by Chief Officer 04/02/21):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £227,683</li> <li>• Costed Risk Against the Project: £ 22,317</li> <li>• Estimated Programme Dates: Q3 2023</li> </ul> <p><b>GW 2 – Projects Sub-Committee- for decision, May 22 Corporate Asset Sub-Committee March 22</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £217,391</li> <li>• Costed Risk Against the Project: £5,000</li> <li>• Estimated Programme Dates: Start on site Oct 2023</li> </ul> <p><b>GW 345 – OPPSC - for decision, 17<sup>th</sup> April 23, RASC- for decision 2nd May 23</b></p> </div> <p><i>Scope/Design Change and Impact: N/A</i></p> <p><b>'Project Proposal' G2 report (as approved by PSC May '22):</b></p>

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the CoL Intranet website. If this is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the effective date on your copy matches that of the one on-line.

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): £227,683
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): £35,000
- Spend to date: £0
- Costed Risk Against the Project: £5,000
- CRP Requested: £5,000 at GW2
- CRP Drawn Down: £0.00
- Estimated Programme Dates: Start on site Oct 2023

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:*

**'Options Appraisal and Design' G345 report :**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk): **£200,424**
  - Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk): **£200,424**
  - Spend to date: £0
  - Costed Risk Against the Project: £34,838
  - CRP Requested: **£47,486**
  - CRP Drawn Down: £0
- Estimated Programme Dates: Practical completion of works – Mar '24
- 

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:*

**'Authority to start Work' G5 report (as approved by PSC xx/yy/zz):**

- Total Estimated Cost (excluding risk):
- Resources to reach next Gateway (excluding risk)
- Spend to date:
- Costed Risk Against the Project:
- CRP Requested:
- CRP Drawn Down:
- Estimated Programme Dates:

*Scope/Design Change and Impact:*

**Total anticipated on-going commitment post-delivery [£]:<Current Range>**  
**Programme Affiliation[0]:<(If applicable) What is the estimated total programme cost including this project:>**



City of London: Projects Procedure Corporate Risks Register

Project Name:	<b>BEMS Upgrade Project – Phase 2</b>	PM's overall risk rating:	<b>Medium</b>	CRP requested this gateway	<b>£ 47,486</b>	Average unmitigated risk	<b>8.5</b>	Open Risks	<b>15</b>
Unique project identifier:	12331	Total estimated cost (exc risk):	<b>£ 200,424</b>	Total CRP used to date	<b>£ -</b>	Average mitigated risk score	<b>5.5</b>	Closed Risks	<b>0</b>

General risk classification										Mitigation actions										Ownership & Action			
Risk ID	Gateway	Category	Description of the Risk	Risk Impact Description	Likelihood Classification pre-mitigation	Impact Classification pre-mitigation	Risk score	Costed Impact pre-mitigation (£)	Costed Risk Provision requested Y/N	Confidence in the estimation	Mitigating actions	Mitigation cost (£)	Likelihood Classification post-mitigation	Impact Classification post-mitigation	Costed Impact post-mitigation (£)	Post-Mitigation risk score	CRP used to date	Use of CRP	Date raised	Named Departmental Risk Manager/Coordinator	Risk owner (Named Officer or External Party)	Date Closed OR/Realised & moved to issues	Comment(s)
R1	3	(10) Physical	Presence of asbestos containing material which requires management prior to works being undertaken	Additional project costs and time delays	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	C - Uncomfortable	Survey to reduce uncertainty (cost included in project budget), add in float time to account for potential delays. If risk budget costs and risk provision to be refined between GW2-GW3/4 through further market testing and benchmark.	£0.00	Likely	Minor	£10,986.00	4	£0.00	Management/removal of asbestos to allow safe installation of works	20/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R3	5	(2) Financial	Unforeseen additional costs related to with Fire/life safety/power or enclosures	Insufficient budget to cover enabling works	Possible	Serious	6	£0.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	Engagement with Stakeholder to establish how much work needs to be done.	£0.00	Possible	Major	£21,000.00	12	£0.00	Cover potential higher quoted costs from PC	20/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R4	5	(2) Financial	Extra Out of hours working required	Insufficient budget to cover extra OOH Working	Unlikely	Serious	4	£0.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	Good project planning, driven by competent appointed Project Manager, to minimise the likelihood and impact of known or potential disruption, this cost for design, procure, and installed/managed in accordance with regulations	£0.00	Possible	Minor	£2,500.00	3	£0.00	Cover extra OOH costs sub-contractor	20/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R5	6	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	Disruption to site services/operators during installation	Some level of disruption (interruption to the operation of building assets being replaced) is inevitable, the potential impact of the disruption is project specific. Costed result to cost or fail.	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	Through due diligence, Control of Contractors, and Project Manager resource: ensure specification and installation meets standards. Engagement with a high confidence for meeting project life basis	£0.00	Likely	Minor	£0.00	4	£0.00		21/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R6	6	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	An accident/injury related to the works being undertaken for the installation	Depends on the nature of the accident/injury, but potentially project delays and legal action.	Possible	Extreme	24	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	Consult with corporate property stakeholders to ensure appropriate site.	£0.00	Rare	Extreme	£0.00	8	£0.00		22/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R7	6	(4) Contractual/Partnership	Installation is not compliant	Depending on the nature of the compliance this could have minor to major issues. It could result in essential services being shut-down or installation rework being required.	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	Through due diligence, Control of Contractors, and Project Manager resource: ensure specification and installation meets standards. Engagement with a high confidence for meeting project life basis	£0.00	Rare	Extreme	£0.00	8	£0.00		23/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R8	6	(5) H&S/Wellbeing	Occupants/users are not satisfied with final outcome	Poor performance from new building services could result in minor or major dissatisfaction depending on the resulting issues.	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	Consult with corporate property stakeholders to ensure appropriate site.	£0.00	Rare	Major	£0.00	4	£0.00		24/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R9	6	(8) Technology	Installed assets fail before anticipated life	Impact on BAU	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	Prepare project programme as required	£0.00	Unlikely	Major	£0.00	8	£0.00		25/12/2021				
R10	6	(2) Financial	Site changes result in early redundancy of installed assets	Anticipated savings on installed assets are not achieved	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00	N	B - Fairly Confident	Get assurance for supplier that assets will be available.	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£0.00	4	£0.00		26/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R11	6	(2) Financial	Consultant Engineers Fee Quote higher than expected	Consultant Engineers Fee Quote higher than expected	Unlikely	Major	8	£0.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	B - Fairly Confident	Work closely with Col IT and R&E	£0.00	Unlikely	Serious	£1,500.00	4	£0.00		27/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R12	3	(2) Financial	Delay in providing/recruiting Project Manager to manage the process following GW2/GW3 decision.	Delay to project programme	Unlikely	Minor	2	£0.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	C - Uncomfortable		£0.00	Possible	Minor	£1,500.00	3	£0.00		28/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R14	5	(2) Financial	Global supply Chain delay of GW2/GW3 equipment	Additional project costs and time delays	Unlikely	Serious	4	£0.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	C - Uncomfortable		£0.00	Possible	Serious	£2,500.00	6	£0.00	Cover potential extra cost of alternative cover additional surveys, purchase of IT equipment	21/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R15	3	(2) Financial	Addition IT costs - Cabling, Switch	Additional cost to project if any	Possible	Major	12	£0.00	Y - for costed impact post-mitigation	C - Uncomfortable		£0.00	Possible	Serious	£7,500.00	6	£0.00		20/12/2021	City Surveyor's, Corporate Energy Team	Graeme Low		
R16	3																						
R17							£0.00								£0.00								
R18							£0.00								£0.00								
R19							£0.00								£0.00								
R20							£0.00								£0.00								
R21							£0.00								£0.00								
R22							£0.00								£0.00								
R23							£0.00								£0.00								
R24							£0.00								£0.00								
R25							£0.00								£0.00								
R26							£0.00								£0.00								
R27							£0.00								£0.00								
R28							£0.00								£0.00								
R29							£0.00								£0.00								
R30							£0.00								£0.00								
R31							£0.00								£0.00								
R32							£0.00								£0.00								
R33							£0.00								£0.00								
R34							£0.00								£0.00								
R35							£0.00								£0.00								
R36							£0.00								£0.00								
R37							£0.00								£0.00								
R38							£0.00								£0.00								
R39							£0.00								£0.00								
R40							£0.00								£0.00								
R41							£0.00								£0.00								
R42							£0.00								£0.00								
R43							£0.00								£0.00								
R44							£0.00								£0.00								
R45							£0.00								£0.00								
R46							£0.00								£0.00								
R47							£0.00								£0.00								
R48							£0.00								£0.00								
R49							£0.00								£0.00								
R50							£0.00								£0.00								
R51							£0.00								£0.00								
R52							£0.00								£0.00								
R53							£0.00								£0.00								
R54							£0.00								£0.00								
R55							£0.00								£0.00								
R56							£0.00								£0.00								

R57								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R58								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R59								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R60								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R61								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R62								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R63								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R64								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R65								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R66								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R67								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R68								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R69								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R70								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R71								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R72								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R73								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R74								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R75								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R76								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R77								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R78								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R79								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R80								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R81								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R82								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R83								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R84								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R85								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R86								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R87								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R88								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R89								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R90								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R91								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R92								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R93								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R94								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R95								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R96								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R97								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R98								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R99								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00
R100								£0.00					£0.00					£0.00				£0.00

Building	Supply/Install £	Consultants PM Fees	Works Total Excl CRP	CRP	Total Incl CRP	Fund	Split
The View	£18,295.79	£2,000	£20,296		£25,369.74	CC	56%
The Temple	£19,982.70	£1,984	£21,967		£27,458.37	CC	
The Warren	£50,406.75	£2,000	£52,407		£62,888.10	CC	
Harrow Road Pavilion	£15,716.53	£2,000	£17,717		£22,145.66	CC	
HARC	£86,037.92	£2,000	£88,038		£110,047.40	CF	44%
<b>Total</b>	<b>£190,439.69</b>	<b>£9,984</b>	<b>£200,424</b>	<b>£47,486</b>	<b>£247,909</b>		<b>100%</b>

Fig. 1 Site cost breakdown

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank