



## Policy and Resources Committee

- Date:** TUESDAY, 4 OCTOBER 2022
- Time:** 2.30 pm or at the rising of Resource Allocation Sub-Committee (whichever is later)
- Venue:** COMMITTEE ROOMS, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING, GUILDHALL
- Members:**
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)       | Deputy Andrien Meyers  |
| Deputy Keith Bottomley (Deputy Chairman)    | Deputy Brian Mooney  |
| Tijs Broeke (Vice-Chair)                    | Deputy Alastair Moss (Ex-Officio Member)                       |
| Mary Durcan (Vice-Chair)                    | Benjamin Murphy  |
| Munsur Ali                                  | Alderman Sir William Russell                                   |
| Deputy Randall Anderson (Ex-Officio Member) | Ruby Sayed (Ex-Officio Member)                                 |
| Deputy Rehana Ameer                         | Tom Sleigh   |
| Deputy Marianne Fredericks                  | Deputy Sir Michael Snyder                                      |
| Alderman Timothy Hailes                     | Deputy James Thomson   |
| Caroline Haines                             | James Tumbridge  |
| Deputy Shravan Joshi                        | Deputy Philip Woodhouse  |
| Deputy Edward Lord                          | Deputy Henry Colthurst (Ex-Officio Member)                     |
| Alderman Ian David Luder                    | Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member)                                 |
| Alderman & Sheriff Nicholas Lyons           | Deputy Simon Duckworth (Chief Comm oner) (Ex-Officio Member)   |
| Catherine McGuinness                        | The Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor Vincent Keaveny (Ex-Officio Member) |
| Wendy Mead                                  |  |

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

### Accessing the virtual public meeting

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:  
[<Policy and Resources Committee 04/10/2022 - YouTube>](#)

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.

**John Barradell**  
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

# AGENDA

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

## Part 1 - Public Agenda

### 1. APOLOGIES

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

### 3. MINUTES

To consider minutes as follows:-

- a) To agree the public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 7th July 2022 (Pages 7 - 16)
- b) \*To note the Public Minutes of the Freedom Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 21st July 2022
- c) \*To note the public minutes of the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee meeting on 20th July 2022
- d) \*To Note the draft Public Minutes of the Capital Buildings Board meeting on 13th July 2022
- e) \*To note a public summary of the City Envoy Network meeting held on Tuesday 5th July 2022

### 4. 2022 CITY OF LONDON ELECTIONS

Report of the Deputy Town Clerk.

**For Discussion**  
(Pages 17 - 30)

### 5. PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING ARRANGEMENTS

Joint report of the Town Clerk, Executive Director of Environment and Comptroller and City Solicitor (to be read in conjunction with the non-public appendix at item 18)

**For Decision**  
(Pages 31 - 38)

6. **APPOINTMENT OF LEAD MEMBERS (POLICY AREAS)**  
Report of the Town Clerk.  
  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 39 - 46)
7. **NOMINATION TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE MUSEUM OF LONDON**  
Report of the Town Clerk.  
  
*To be read in conjunction with the confidential appendix at agenda item*  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 47 - 56)
8. **CORPORATION REPRESENTATION ON THE GREEN FINANCE INSTITUTE BOARD**  
Report of the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth.  
  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 57 - 60)
9. **FREEDOM APPLICATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND ACCESS**  
Report of the Town Clerk.  
  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 61 - 68)
10. **FINANCIAL SERVICES SKILLS COMMISSION**  
Report of the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth.  
  
**For Decision**  
(Pages 69 - 76)
11. **\*DESTINATION CITY UPDATE**  
Report of the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth.  
  
**For Information**
12. **\*END OF CAMPAIGN EVALUATION: SQUARE MILE**  
Joint report of the Director of Innovation and Growth and Director of Communications.  
  
**For Information**
13. **\*DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**  
Report of the Town Clerk.  
  
**For Information**

14. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
16. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**  
MOTION - That under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of the Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act.

**Part 2 - Non-Public Agenda**

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**  
To consider non-public minutes of meetings as follows:-
  - a) To agree the non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 7th July 2022 (Pages 77 - 82)
  - b) \*To Note the non-public minutes of the Freedom Applications Sub-Committee meeting held on 21st July 2022
  - c) \*To note the draft non-public minutes of the Capital Buildings Board meeting held on 13th July 2022
  - d) \*To note the non-public minutes of the Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 20th July 2022
18. **PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING ARRANGEMENTS**  
Joint report of the Town Clerk, Executive Director of Environment and Comptroller and City Solicitor (non-public appendix to be read in conjunction with a public report at item 6).

**For Decision**  
(Pages 83 - 84)

19. **ENHANCING THE IMPACT OF COL'S US WORKSTREAMS THROUGH A PERMANENT US PRESENCE**  
Report of the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 85 - 90)

20. **\*NON PUBLIC DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY OR URGENCY POWERS**  
Report of the Town Clerk.

**For Information**

21. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
22. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED.**

**Part 3 Confidential Agenda – circulated separately**

23. **MINUTES**  
To consider minutes as follows: -
- a) To agree the confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 7th July 2022.
  - b) To agree the confidential minutes of the reconvened Policy and Resources Committee meeting (7th July 2022) held on 12th July 2022
  - c) To note the confidential minutes of the Freedom Applications Sub-Committee meeting on 21st July 2022
  - d) To note the confidential minutes of the Capital Buildings Board meeting on 13th July 2022
  - e) To note the confidential minutes of the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee meeting on 20th July 2022
24. **CONFIDENTIAL APPENDIX: NOMINATION TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE MUSEUM OF LONDON**  
*Confidential appendix to be read in conjunction with the public report at agenda item 7.*

**For Decision**

This page is intentionally left blank

## **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE** **Thursday, 7 July 2022**

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 7 July 2022 at 1.45 pm and available to view at [www.youtube.com/watch?v=xbIPEJP1fpM](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xbIPEJP1fpM)

### **Present**

#### **Members:**

Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)  
Deputy Keith Bottomley (Deputy Chairman)  
Tijs Broeke (Vice-Chair)  
Mary Durcan (Vice-Chair)  
Munsur Ali  
Deputy Rehana Ameer  
Deputy Henry Colthurst (Ex-Officio Member)  
Deputy Simon Duckworth (Chief Commoner) (Ex-Officio Member)  
Deputy Marianne Fredericks  
Alderman Timothy Hailes  
Caroline Haines  
Wendy Hyde (Ex-Officio Member)  
Deputy Shravan Joshi  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Alderman Ian David Luder  
Catherine McGuinness  
Deputy Andrien Meyers  
Deputy Brian Mooney  
Benjamin Murphy  
Deputy Sir Michael Snyder  
Deputy James Thomson  
James Tumbridge  
Deputy Philip Woodhouse

#### **In Attendance (In Guildhall)**

Paul Singh  
Madush Gupta  
Oliver Sells

#### **In Attendance (Observing Online)**

Wendy Mead  
Randall Anderson  
Henry Pollard

#### **Officers:**

Caroline Al-Beyerty	- Chamberlain
Deborah Cluett	- Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department
Paul Double	- City Remembrancer
Damian Nussbaum	- Executive Director, Innovation &

Bob Roberts	Growth
Polly Dunn, Clerk	- Deputy Town Clerk
Nicholas Gill	- Town Clerk's Department
Juliemma McLoughlin	- City Surveyor's Department
Ben Milligan	- Executive Director Environment
Greg Moore	- Markets Director
Lisa Moore	- Assistant Town Clerk
Chris Rumbles	- Chief Operating Officer's Department
Genine Whitehorne	- Town Clerk's Department
Paul Wright	- Chief Operating Officer's Department
Peter Young	- Remembrancer's Office
	- City Surveyor's Department

The Chairman referred to events that were still unfolding in Government and stressed that it would be preceptive to respond at this point. Officers, led by the Deputy Town Clerk, were looking at any immediate implications and actions needed were all in hand.

A Member remarked on the importance of thanking John Glen for his long service as City Minister and for the outstanding job he did whilst in office and proposed his Freedom of the City be expedited in recognition of this. The Chairman agreed, further commenting on the outstanding job and sterling service John Glen had given during his period as City Minister, with it only right that this was recognised today, whilst also looking to secure a date for his Freedom of the City at the earliest opportunity.

### 1. **APOLOGIES**

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

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

There were no declarations.

### 3. **MINUTES**

- a) The public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 9 June 2022 were approved as an accurate record, subject the following amendments: -

Removal of Brian Mooney's name from the list of those Members present at the meeting and the addition of Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee as a cross cutting area the Recovery Taskforce should be co-ordinating with as part of the Destination City Recovery.

- b) The public minutes of the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 30 May 2022 were noted.



- c) The draft public minutes of the Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub Committee meeting held on 7 June 2022 were noted.

A Member referred to the Review of Sport Provision and sought clarity that, following agreement of an internal follow up review, no steps would be taken by officers that would change the current arrangement for sport provision, pending the work that was to be undertaken by the Sports Engagement Manager. The Deputy Town Clerk responded and suggested this proposal be put on hold for the moment, with there having been no substantive discussion among officers on this point, confirming assurances would be sought before moving any further.

- d) The draft public minutes of the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 May 2022 were noted.
- e) The draft public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting on 17 May 2022 were noted.
- f) A draft summary of the Competitiveness Advisory Board meeting on 12 May 2022 was noted.

#### 4. **LEAD MEMBERS (POLICY AREAS)**

The Committee considered a report of the Town Clerk providing an update on an outcome from the Governance Review being the endorsement of greater use of Lead Members on Policy and Resources Committee and seeking approval of the creation of Policy Lead roles, a job description and appointment process.

The Chairman introduced the item explaining how the report presented initial proposals for Policy Lead roles in areas that reflected some of the most strategic issues facing Policy and Resources Committee and the City Corporation where an additional level of focus and support would be particularly welcomed. The Chairman added that he was keen to keep the number of Policy Lead areas fairly focussed in the first instance, as the posts were being fully established and to allow time to understand how they were working.

The Chairman remarked on Destination City as being an area of major strategic focus and, as Chairman, one he should lead on personally. The Chairman further highlighted the growing importance of sport, with development of the City Corporation's new Sports Strategy and of the very real importance of this area of work. There would be a real benefit in having a key individual to support the Chairman of Communications & Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee as they deliver activation of the Sports Strategy. The Chairman proposed a Sport Engagement Policy Lead be added as a lead role, with delegated authority being sought to allow for eligibility criteria to be drawn up and approved following the meeting.

During the discussion that followed there was a consensus of support for the creation of Policy Lead roles, with a number of observations and areas highlighted for consideration. These included a need to fully utilise existing

and new Member experience, ensuring the Policy Lead roles worked in support of departments and were not seen as having oversight of them, as well as a need to understand what success from the roles would look like. It was suggested a level of transparency would be needed in the appointment process for each role.

The Chairman explained that he would be looking for individuals to be active in the roles to ensure their success. The selection process would be completed with integrity and transparency with applications being requested from the whole Court and not only Policy and Resources Committee Members. The Chairman assured Members that Policy Leads would be asked to support officers with the work of the department rather than providing oversight of them. The Chairman asked Members to trust him with the appointment process as outlined and confirmed that he would look to select individuals based on relevant experience and the expertise they can offer.

A Member commented on there being no Policy Lead area providing a level of focus on residents and the Chairman responded by reminding Members of his first statement to the Court as Chairman when he stressed the importance of a reset with residents and of this being an area that he would lead on personally. The Chairman confirmed that he had already visited every estate in the Square Mile with a local Ward Member and that he continued to look to improve relations with residents through improved engagement and listening.

The Chairman concluded the discussion, stating his wish to keep the Policy Lead areas on the basis that had been set out. This process was not looking to stop anything from happening but was rather looking to supplement what was already being done and with the heavy workload not all falling on one individual.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

1. Endorse the creation of Policy Lead roles for the areas set out in paragraph 10, with the addition of a Sport Engagement Policy Lead.
2. Approve the proposed job description for Policy Leads set out at Appendix 1 and draft eligibility criteria for appointment at Appendix 2.
3. Approve delegated authority being granted to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman to approve eligibility criteria for the Sports Engagement Policy Lead.
4. Approve the appointments process set out in paragraph 20.
5. **COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND - APPROVAL OF POLICY CHANGES**

The Committee considered a report of the Managing Director of Bridge House Estates and Chief Charities Officer seeking approval of policy changes to the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF) following feedback from a public consultation carried out in May 2022.

A Member sought reassurance that officers were starting to think creatively with the local community in looking at getting slightly different focussed projects coming forward. There was also a suggestion that recommendation 3a and reference to 'applications demonstrate exceptional community benefit' was vague, with there being ambiguity around what constituted exceptional benefit. In response, it was clarified that officers were awaiting the decision of this committee before beginning a communications drive on the CILNF and what it can support. Members' support would be an important part of the process through their work on the ground, working with communities and in explaining the process. A briefing document would be provided to all Members to allow them to attend ward meetings and talk about the CILNF.

Members noted 'exceptional benefit' was part of the reporting to Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, with any applications over £500k being assessed on a case-by-case basis, which is within the statute itself and 'exceptional benefit' has a very specific framework; having a cap in place allows for appropriate budgeting throughout the year.

A Member highlighted the need for a holistic approach, empowering small organisations or those not constituted correctly that fall through the net and do not qualify for CILNF. Members were reminded of the wider work of the Central Grants Unit and other areas of grant funding available, with the team always happy to talk to people and direct them to other areas where they can get appropriate advice.

It was further clarified that applications not recommended would be reported through to Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, with full feedback being given to applicants and with them having the option to reapply. All applications would be added to the website so new applicants can see those previously supported.

A Member suggested the Small Business Centre as a good place to promote CILNF from a social enterprise perspective.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

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

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

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Operating Officer responding to points raised on the Responsible Procurement Policy presented at Policy and Resources Committee in June and seeking approval of changes to the Policy in response to the comments raised.

The Chairman referred to the updated policy being presented following discussion and points raised at the last Policy and Resources Committee meeting in June, which he hoped now addressed the concerns raised as part of the debate. A Member, also Chairman of Finance Committee, added that he considered the updated policy to be exactly what had been asked for and that it should be approved.

RESOLVED: That Members: -

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

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

The Committee received a report of the Director of Innovation & Growth providing an interim update to the Beckford and Cass Statues Interpretation Project.

A Member raised a point of order in relation to those items presented for information and suggested certain items should be presented for discussion where they required more than noting. The Town Clerk responded confirming the Committee Team had been asked to consider adding items for discussion moving forwards, with this requiring input of the Chair and relevant officers to determine.

A Member questioned the historical accuracy with some of the text used to describe William Beckford and the Director confirmed the wording was amendable and that he would link him up with the relevant officer so this can be reviewed.

There was concern expressed that temporary signs were being removed during events, with Court of Common Council having agreed to retain the statues and offer an explanation on the history, with this open to interpretation. It was important for the signs to remain in place. This would be brought to the attention of the events team in the Remembrancer's Office.

A Member referred to the Court of Common Council having decided in October 2021 to retain the William Beckford and John Cass statues in Guildhall and

stressed a need to increase pace with the process of producing permanent plaques alongside them with appropriate explanatory wording. The Chairman acknowledged this point and asked officers to consider options to speed up the process.

RECEIVED

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

The Committee received a report of the Director of Innovation and Growth providing an update on the Lord Mayor's and Chairman of Policy's visit to the World Economic Form (WEF) Annual Meeting 2022 in Davos from 23-26 May 2022.

The Chairman highlighted the value of this Forum, with it being key annual event for the City Corporation and stressed the importance of the City being represented through himself and the Lord Mayor working together.

RECEIVED

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

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

RECEIVED

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

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

RECEIVED

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

A Member questioned when they can expect a report back following a review of the City-wide elections and the election process and it was confirmed this would follow in September.

A Member commented on the microphones in the committee rooms presenting an issue with their length when Members were being asked to stand and also with them not having worked from day one. The Chairman confirmed he would ask the Chief Operating Officer to arrange for someone to look again at the microphones.

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

**Planning and Transportation Governance** – The Town Clerk referred to part of the Governance Review that Policy and Resources Committee (P&R) having previously authorised Planning and Transportation Committee (P&T) to consider certain options for carrying out their business and report back to P&R.

Flowing from this, officers had been developing proposals in discussion with the Chair of P&R that address this and other Governance matters with the intention of reporting them to July P&T and 8 September Court. This timetable would not allow for reporting to the next meeting of P&R on 15 September and there was concern to seek approval and implementation of any proposed new P&T arrangements from 8 September Court in time for some significant forthcoming planning applications, since the proposal would make the decisions more robust.

Resolved: That Members: -

- Approve delegated authority being granted to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman to approve arrangements relating to Planning and Transportation Committee Governance.

**13. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

**Part 2 – Non-Public Agenda**

**14. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

- a) The non-public minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 9 June 2022 were approved as an accurate record.
- b) The non-public minutes of the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 30 May 2022 were noted.
- c) The draft non-public minutes of the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 May 2022 were noted.
- d) The draft non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 17 May 2022 were noted.

**15. DESTINATION CITY - NEXT STEPS ON IMPLEMENTATION**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth updating Members on Destination City next steps on implementation.

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

The Committee received a Gateway 4C report of the Director of Community and Children's Services relating to Barbican Podium Waterproofing, Drainage and Landscaping Works (Ben Jonson, Breton & Cromwell Highwalk) Phase 2 – 1<sup>st</sup> Priority Zone.

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

The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor relating to a Waiver Report: Architectural Services (DAVE 2) to Dagenham Dock Development.

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

The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and City Surveyor providing a future liquidation and business plan update relating to Barking Power Station Companies.

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

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

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

There were no non-public questions.

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

**Central Criminal Court Gateway 2 Health and Safety Works** – The Committee considered a request of the City Surveyor relating to Health and Safety Works at the Central Criminal Court.

**River Thames Flotilla** – The Committee considered a request of the Remembrancer relating to a River Thames Flotilla.

**Part 3 - Confidential Agenda**

22. **MINUTES**

a) The confidential minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting on 9 June 2022 were approved as an accurate record.

b) The confidential minutes of the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee meeting on 17 May 2022 were noted.

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

The Committee considered a confidential joint report of the City Surveyor, Projects Governance Director, Chief Operating Officer, Markets Director and Chamberlain relating to negotiations with the SMTA in support of the Museum of London and Markets Co-location Programme.

**The meeting ended at 4.21pm**

-----  
Chairman

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



# Agenda Item 4

<b>Committee(s):</b> Policy and Resources Committee	<b>Dated:</b> 4 October 2022
<b>Subject:</b> 2022 City of London Elections	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	3, 4, 5, 9 and 10
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</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> Deputy Town Clerk	<b>For Discussion</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Mark Gettleson, Head of Campaigns and Community Engagement Saira McKechnie, Head of Electoral Services and City Occupiers Database	

## Summary

1. The postponed Common Councillor elections were held on 22 March 2022. These elections, and the registration efforts leading up to them, were held in a context of ongoing disruption to the City as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.
2. Members of the committee asked officers to come back with a report on these elections that included ideas for them to consider improving participation in future City of London elections.
3. This report provides a summary of the overall trends in these elections, as well as outlining potential changes, including those requiring legislation, for further discussion and future recommendations.

## Recommendations


4. Members are asked to:
  - Note the report.

## Main Report

### Current Position

5. The Covid-19 pandemic meant that the 2022 City of London elections were held at an unprecedented time for the country and the City. The inability to run a meaningful canvass in 2020 reduced the size of the Ward List from 19,200 in 2020-21 to 13,748 in 2021-22. The 2022-23 Ward List was compiled while much of the City was still working remotely, with advice to work from home (“Plan B”) issued a week prior to the registration deadline – and only lifted eight weeks prior to polling day. Moreover, with the postponed election coming almost exactly two years after the first lockdown, the relationship between the working City and the Square Mile was difficult with many workers not having been to the workplace or taken part in in City life in that period.
6. Despite these significant challenges, the 2022 elections proved a success across a number of key metrics. The 2022-23 Ward List stood at 19,595 – a 43% increase and the highest figure for seven years (prior to which legacy names on the Ward List were retained for more than a year). Percentage turnout was down only slightly on 2017, from 33% to 32%, but was higher than in 2013 (25%). The number of votes cast, 5,483, was the largest in the past decade. The number of candidates was down slightly on 2017: 145 to 135.


Figure 1: Ward List trends, 2010-22\*



\* Please note that prior to 2015, two year non-responders were retained on the Ward List.

7. We believe the election engagement campaign and improvements in the administration of the elections by the Electoral Services team were key factors behind the success of these elections – which, given the extremely difficult background against which they were conducted, may have otherwise been damaging for the democratic mandate and reputation of the City Corporation.

Figure 2: Turnout across London local authorities



8. The concerted campaign to encourage voters to switch to a postal vote paid some dividends, with the number of postal votes cast rising by 600 since 2017. Postal voters were more likely to return their ballot: with a 58% return rate compared to 19% turnout for in-person voters. While 34% of the electorate were on a postal vote, they made up 63% of those casting a vote, up from 59% in 2017. Much as this is heavily influenced by the pandemic and the fact the most engaged voters are more likely to take the time to apply for a postal vote, ensuring that the convenience of postal voting – and the need to apply individually – impressed on every voter is likely to benefit turnout in the future.

Figure 3: Turnout trends, 2013-2022 (contested wards only)

	% turnout	Electorate	Votes cast	Postal cast	In person cast
2013	24.9%	20,369	5077	2897	2180
2017	33.4%	14,305	4779	2803	1976
2022	32.4%	16,939	5483	3440	2043

### **Election Engagement Campaign**


9. The Election Engagement campaign was carried out in two phases: a registration campaign during the canvass, running from 1<sup>st</sup> September to 16<sup>th</sup> December 2021 and a turnout campaign running to polling day. The details of the registration campaign is outlined in the January 2022 Election Engagement Campaign report to this committee (see Appendix). In particular, it was felt that significant paid digital outreach (especially on LinkedIn), the recruitment of temporary campaign assistants and cross-organisation working were all key to that phase of the campaign.
  
10. The priority for the turnout phase was to provide voters with the maximum amount of information about candidates and how to participate in the election in a way that was legally compliant and fair to all candidates. In particular, we:
  - a) **Developed an easy-to-use polling station/wardmote locator and candidates guide.** This enabled each voter to enter the address at which they were registered and see the candidates standing for election in their ward, where to meet them and how to vote. Each candidate was asked to submit 200 words to promote their candidacy for each voter to inspect. We received positive feedback from voters and candidates for this resource, especially given the difficulty of meeting worker voters face-to-face, which was exacerbated by the pandemic.
  
  - b) **Distributed a physical postcard to all voters**, split between those on a postal vote and not, giving them key information about the election and encouraging them to inspect the candidates guide and polling station/wardmote location online. This ensured that voters for whom we lack email addresses still had the opportunity to know about this information.
  
  - c) **Digital tools for postal voters**, enabling them to begin their postal vote application online. National legislation dictates that postal vote applications must be physically printed and signed before being returned. However, we gave voters the opportunity of generating an individualised PDF online that made this process more straight-forward.

d) **Sent multiple emails to voters**, reminding them of key dates in the election (such as for postal vote deadlines and wardmotes). Collecting more email addresses should be a goal of future registration campaigns.

11. One of the key areas of focus throughout the campaign has been scalability and replicability, so that tools and systems created for this election can be easily deployed in the future. Each of the above were also used in the turnout campaign for the Aldermanic elections held in 2022.

### Turnout trends between wards

Figure 4: Turnout by ward, March 2022



12. While overall turnout in the City was 32%, there was a significant range within this: from 11% in Farringdon Without to 58% in Portsoken. Several factors appeared to influence individual Ward turnout:

a) **Electoral competition**, defined not only by number of candidates, but whether those candidates engaged in significant campaigning. The seven wards with turnout over 40% all saw individual or groups of candidates run spirited campaigns that drove voters to the polls. In Castle Baynard and Farringdon Without, changes in the levels of candidate campaigning likely saw turnout rise by 7.4% in the former and fall by 9.7% in the latter.

- b) **Residential composition.** Three of the five highest turnout wards were residential wards. This is likely rooted in the fact that we face no relevance challenge among residents: for most, we are their sole local authority and have a clear relationship with them based on service delivery. Their council tax is paid to us, we collect their rubbish, we are often their landlord. Continued patterns of home working over the election period will have likely made it easier than usual for residents to vote on Polling Day, and harder for workers living outside the City. Our residential wards produce some of the highest turnouts in Inner London, with Portsoken only bettered by Dulwich Village.
- c) **Barrister's chambers.** While most City firms can only select a small proportion of their workforce as voters, and often select the most interested and engaged in City life, the vast majority of barristers are able to register, with many registered by their chambers on mass. This can lead to a larger and less engaged electorate in wards with large numbers of barristers such as Farringdon Without (approximately 72% barristers) and Castle Baynard (approximately 29%).
- d) **Large engaged businesses.** Where a ward has a business or group of businesses that are especially engaged in registration and the election, this can boost turnout overall – the presence of the London Stock Exchange in Bread Street and Lloyd's and other major insurance firms in Lime Street likely positively impact turnout figures in those wards. The former even held an online hustings for candidates. Some businesses decision to select voters to register at random – rather than asking for those interested – likely had the effect of lowering turnout

### **Candidate engagement**


13. The committee made clear its wish to increase the number and diversity of candidates standing for election. The Covid-19 pandemic meant that regular in-person contact with potential candidates was extremely difficult, with the “pipeline” stalled for much of two years. However, two events were held with candidates prior to the election and they were regularly updated with fresh information by email or through direct inquiries. Many candidates, including several successfully-elected new members from non-traditional backgrounds later told us that they made the decision to stand as a result of the engagement events.
14. While significantly more information was provided to potential candidates than previously, it would likely be of benefit to work with new members to identify key questions that they would have found useful in making the decision to stand. Additionally, a multi-year approach to candidate engagement events should be undertaken to encourage talented and diverse individuals across the City to stand for election. This would include improved information on

candidate conduct, and while it would not be possible to force candidates to agree to a Code of Conduct beyond the existing statutory requirements, alternatives should be considered ahead of the next all-out elections.

15. Increasing numbers of candidates will be key to improving electoral participation in the future, as much of the work to engage voters with the election is done by candidates and people are more likely to vote they feel they have a choice of who to elect. While London boroughs have an average of 3.4 candidates per vacancy, with the major parties often standing full slates, our election saw just 1.35 candidates per vacancy.

16. While the London Borough with the lowest number of candidates per vacancy (Barking & Dagenham) also saw the lowest turnout, the borough with the highest number (Tower Hamlets) saw the highest turnout in Inner London. Indeed, while there were six uncontested wards in the City this year, there were none elsewhere in Greater London. We should welcome and encourage competition in wards, as a means of encouraging participation and electoral choice.

Figure 5: Candidates per vacancy across London local authorities, 2022



17. Lack of electoral competition in Common Councillor elections has been a feature over the past decade, however there does seem to be a long-term trend towards greater competition in Aldermanic elections.

Figure: Common Councillor contests (100 vacancies), 2009-22

	Wards contested	Wards uncontested	Candidates
2009	13	12	128
2013	21	4	161
2017	15	6	145
2022	15	6	135

Figure: Aldermanic contests, 2010-22

	Contests	Contested	Uncontested	Candidates	Per vacancy
2010	2	1	1	3	1.5
2011	5	4	1	6	1.2
2012	5	5	0	5	1.0
2013	9	5	4	14	1.6
2014	3	2	1	6	2.0
2015	2	0	2	5	2.5
2016	2	1	1	3	1.5
2017	6	2	4	17	2.8
2018	6	3	3	16	2.7
2019	7	5	2	13	1.9
2022	7	7	0	20	2.9

### **Potential changes to electoral practices**

18. Several changes to our electoral practices have been suggested by Members, officers and others in recent years and the Committee has asked for an overview of such proposals.

19. The following proposals would require changes to national legislation governing City of London ward elections, but would not affect elections elsewhere and we regard as worth further consideration by Members and officers:

- a) **Allow non-responders to remain on the Ward List.** While other authorities require evidence to remove voters from their electoral register, the City of London is unique in requiring voters to register for the Ward List each year and otherwise be removed. This is likely responsible for large numbers of people losing their registration. Moreover, a cycle is created for worker voters



by failing to register each year, as an organisation loses its list of existing names for the next and must start again from scratch. Amending legislation to allow the City Corporation to retain non-responding voters for a period longer than a year would provide immediate benefit to engagement in our elections.

- b) **Introduce rolling registration**, the ability to register to vote throughout the year. One of the unique elements of City of London elections is that we only have an annual canvass running from the qualification date of 1<sup>st</sup> September until 16<sup>th</sup> December – which then leads to a Ward List for one year from 16<sup>th</sup> February of the subsequent year. While in all other authorities, applications to vote can be made up to 12 working days before an election, the deadline to register in a City of London election (such as a by-election) in late January could have been more than 400 days previously. Similarly, a registered individual who departed the City on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2021 would still be entitled to vote in our elections into 2023. Given the natural churn of the City workforce, exacerbated by the pandemic, this static model is has significant drawbacks. Several workplaces have contacted us in advance of this year's Aldermanic elections, requesting changes to their registration due to colleagues' departure, which legislation does not allow us to carry out. Rolling registration would also avoid a situation in election years, seen most notably this year, where a substantial portion of the electorate came on to the Ward List for the first time just a month prior to polling day.
- c) **Amend the nomination formula for worker voters**. The current formula for nominating workers at companies and other organisations gives one vote to every five workers, up to fifty staff, and one for every fifty thereafter. This has the intended effect of giving a disproportionately larger share of worker votes to those in small workplaces – and avoids any one company dominating the electorate in a given ward. Indeed, approximately seven in ten eligible worker voters is in a workplace of under 250 staff. In practice, however, this puts a ceiling (likely less than 10%) on the number of City workers who are able to become voters and allocates the majority of potential votes towards harder-to-contact workplaces, with whom we often have no relationship.
- d) **Extend the franchise to cover co-working spaces**. Currently, organisations or sole traders who own or rent all or part of a City workplace with a freehold or lease are eligible to register voters. However, since the legislation was written, co-working spaces have become common in the City, and are especially popular among the SME and startup community. Organisations and individuals normally occupy these premises with a licence rather than a lease. In order not to further disenfranchise this section of the City worker community, legislation could be amended to allow those occupying City premises with a long-term licence (such as three months or more) as their primary place of work to register.

20. The following proposals would require changes to primary legislation affecting all UK elections. These are therefore unlikely to be successfully introduced and officers are not recommending they be taken forward:

- a) **Online voting.** There is currently no provision for online voting in the UK and conversations with the Cabinet Office in 2020 showed no appetite for a trial. While practiced for local elections in some parts of Canada and elsewhere, online voting is comparatively rare internationally and has never been discussed seriously in a UK context. Indeed, once introduced, the requirement to produce ID at polling stations in the UK elections strengthens the presumption towards in-person voting.
- b) **All-postal election.** There is no existing provision for a local authority being allowed to conduct an all-postal ballot. Indeed, the rules around the length of time an individual can hold a postal vote without reapplying have been tightened by the recent Elections Act. Similarly, the individual registering worker voters at their organisation cannot apply for postal votes on their behalf – the law states these must be physically signed by each individual.

21. Other changes that might benefit the efficient operation of our elections, and could be introduced by Members through an Act of Common Council, could include:

- a) **Centralised count.** A single count at the Guildhall, as practiced by other local authorities, rather than individual ward counts would significantly reduce the number of external counting staff needing to be brought in and allowing the Head of Electoral Services more oversight over the conduct of each count. It would also be a focus point for interest in the election and ensure that candidates across the City and the media were up to speed on developing results.
- b) **Polling station and wardmote locations.** Allowing these to be located a short distance outside a ward boundary would enable venues to be co-located. This would have the effect of reducing staff burdens and cost, as well as removing the need for emergency premises such as Portakabins.

We intend to consult further on these and bring back firm recommendations in the future.

### **Potential changes to City Corporation practices**

22. While some changes to improve engagement in our elections are legislative, perhaps more important are changes to our practices, many of which do not deal with elections directly, but aim to increase the relevance of and interest in

the City Corporation among our potential electorate, especially among workers. Almost all of such engagement work is the responsibility of the organisation as a whole and sits outside the purview of Electoral Services.

- a) **Long-term investment in elections infrastructure.** Due to the wholly unique nature of our elections, many tools and processes need to be developed by our Electoral Services team that cannot simply be deployed from elsewhere, from databases to registration campaign material. Many of the issues faced by the administration of our elections in the past have stemmed from a lack of long-term investment over decades.
- b) **Refocus stakeholder engagement on all workplaces.** The vast majority of potential City voters (approximately seven in ten) are in workplaces of under 250 staff. Many more are in workplaces that are neither financial or professional services. While many of these are SMEs, large numbers are City offices of larger companies headquartered elsewhere. As an organisation, we have a meaningful relationship with comparatively few of these organisations, a fact reflected in their low engagement with our activities and elections.
- c) **Develop new avenues of engagement with the working City.** While our relationships with the senior leadership of the top financial and professional services firms and the civic city are strong, we must reconsider our offer as a whole to the average member of our half a million-strong worker community. Our events and communications programmes should prioritise finding new ways to reach City workers and create activities that reflect their interests. Relationships should be formed with groups such as HR managers, who act as the gatekeepers of the City workforce but are too often overlooked.
- d) **Bring together diverse City leaders.** In order to increase our pool of active and engaged worker voters, who might be interested in becoming registration contacts and eventually candidates, we should work more deeply with diversity networks across the City. City firms of all sizes have Women's, BAME, LGBT and other networks, and we should use our convening power to bring them together. This is especially key given the wish to increase the diversity of the Court of Common Council and the requirement that an organisation's registrations to reflect the make-up of its workforce.
- e) **Track all relationships and improve email lists.** We are significantly limited by the contact details we hold across the working City and the lack of engagement with our central CRM. All externally facing officers should have access to the CRM and we will hold further discussions to achieve this. If we do not possess a complete picture of the relationships we hold, we cannot identify gaps and develop new ones. Similarly, we have not prioritised the collection of email addresses among both workers and residents – and ensuring that those we do collect are permissioned for a variety of engagement purposes. This will benefit our elections directly, as any contact

details held by the City Corporation can be used by the Electoral Services team for the purposes of registration.

- f) **Empower Members to engage their constituents.** Elected Members have a key role to play in engaging their constituents with the City Corporation and new means must be found to help them with that work – rather than simply send out a ward newsletter to the small proportion of the constituents on the Ward List.

Following this report and after feedback from Members and officers we will bring further measures to enhance community engagement forward.

### **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

- 23. The work of Electoral Services and the Community Engagement continues to assist the City Corporation's vision in terms of its Corporate Plan. It will help the organisation's contribution to a flourishing society, ensuring people have equal opportunities to enrich their lives through our democracy. The activities and engagement are helping to encourage residents and businesses to become more invested in engaging with democracy at a local level. It is helping to build more socially responsible businesses by engaging them in City democracy and encouraging them to promote diversity among voters and candidates. By reaching out to stakeholders and partners, we are making communities better-connected and encouraging collaboration across our organisation.

### **Financial implications**

- 24. None

### **Resource implications**

- 25. While there are no recommendations in this report, many of the ideas suggested will have resource implications when further developed in the future.

### **Legal implications**

- 26. Electoral Services and Election Engagement continue to work closely with City Solicitors to ensure that all activity is compliant, including with the GDPR.

### **Equalities implications**

27. The aim of our Election Engagement work is to increase participation in the election and candidate diversity, making them more accessible to a wider and more diverse audience, including those with protected characteristics. The Community Engagement ideas for discussion contained in this report further aim to make the City Corporation accessible and accountable to a diverse range of City workers and residents.

## **Climate implications**

28. The proposals included in this paper do not carry any significant implications for the Climate Action programme.

## **Background Papers**

Reports to the Policy and Resources Committee:-

- 20 February 2020 – Common Council Elections in March 2021
- 7 May and 9 July 2020– COVID-19 Implications – possible postponement of the City-Wide elections in March 2021
- 10 September and 8 October 2020 - Common Council Elections Change of Date from March 2021 to March 2022 – Bill for an Act of Common Council
- 19 November 2020 – Electoral Registration Update
- 10 December 2020 – Electoral Registration Campaign Manager
- 8 April 2021 – Election Engagement Campaign
- 8 July 2021 – Election Engagement Campaign Update
- 14 October 2021 – Election Engagement Campaign
- 20 January 2022 – Election Engagement Campaign

### **Mark Gettleson**

Head of Campaigns and Community Engagement

E: [mark.gettleson@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:mark.gettleson@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

T: 07596 888 230

Saira McKechnie

Head of Electoral Services and City Occupier Database

E: [saira.mckechnie@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:saira.mckechnie@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

T: 020 4558 3967

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 5

<b>Committee:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
Policy and Resources Committee Court of Common Council	<b>4 October 2022</b>
<b>Subject:</b> Planning and Transportation Committee Meeting Arrangements	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	4, 10
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</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> Town Clerk, Executive Director of Environment and Comptroller and City Solicitor	<b>For Decision</b>

## Summary

This report considers how the functions of the Planning and Transportation Committee can be most effectively discharged. It recommends the establishment of a Planning Applications Sub-Committee to address the issues of (i) allowing Planning and Transportation Committee to major on strategic and policy issues; and (ii) planning application decisions on land or buildings for which Planning and Transportation Committee has responsibility. This was considered by Planning and Transportation Committee at its meeting of 19 July and Recommendations 1, 2, 4 & 5 were agreed. Recommendation 3 was not before Planning and Transportation Committee (as explained in paragraph 6 of this report)

## Recommendation

That **Policy and Resources Committee** resolve to recommend to Court of Common Council

1. The establishment of a Planning Applications Sub-Committee to determine all planning and listed building consent applications not delegated to officers under the Scheme of Delegation (with all other functions within the Terms of Reference of the Planning and Transportation Committee not delegated to officers continuing to be exercised by that Committee or any other Sub-committees to which it delegates functions)
2. That the membership, Chairmanship and Deputy Chairmanship of and arrangements for the Planning Applications Sub-Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee be as set out in the "Proposals" section of this report
3. That the proposed membership of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee (to be constituted of all members of Planning and Transportation Committee) should not be amended other than by Court of Common Council

4. That the Town Clerk, Executive Director Environment and Comptroller and City Solicitor be delegated to prepare such amendments to the Planning Protocol as may be necessary to give effect of Recommendations 1 & 2 and to report them to Planning and Transportation Committee (which shall be delegated the function of approving the Planning Protocol prior to implementation of the arrangements)
5. That any further updating of the Planning Protocol be delegated to Planning and Transportation Committee

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. Lord Lisvane's Governance Review published in late 2020 ("the Review") made recommendations in respect of the Planning and Transportation Committee. These included reduced membership, consideration of planning applications by small panels, ensuring the Committee's focus on strategic and policy issues, and restricting participation in planning decisions by ward members and members of the committee responsible for managing the City's properties "to distance the planning function from the proprietorial" .
2. Since this Review, refinements to "distance the planning function from the proprietorial" have been introduced<sup>1</sup> (as a result of case law<sup>2</sup> which provided guidance on how the planning function should be separated from the landowner/developer role, where both are undertaken by the City). The "Separation of Functions" arrangements now incorporated in the Planning Protocol are considered to address the issue of "distancing the planning function from the proprietorial". In addition, as noted in the Review, Regulation 10 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 ("Regulation 10") prohibits decisions being taken by a committee, sub-committee (or officer) with responsibility for management of the land or buildings to which the application relates. The governance implications of this are addressed below.
3. In respect of Panels, detailed consideration was given to Panel arrangements with Policy and Resources Committee<sup>3</sup> authorising Planning and Transportation Committee to consider and report back on options. Dialogue, debate and stakeholder consultation ensued, which demonstrated significant concerns of members and service users to decisions being taken by Panels and by a small membership. A widespread preference was perceived for decisions on planning applications to continue to be made by a broader membership, given the unique characteristics of the City. No further action was taken in respect of membership numbers and Panels and none is recommended in this report
4. Ongoing consideration has also continued by way of informal consultation of committee members by the Chair of Planning and Transportation Committee, largely into timing of meetings, conduct of debate and management of external speakers making representations at Planning and Transportation Committee. It is envisaged that the feedback to that informal consultation will inform the Chair

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Protocol Part 4 Paragraph 8e

<sup>2</sup> R(London Parks and Gardens Trust) v Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government [2020] EWHC 2580 (Admin)

<sup>3</sup> 8 July 2021



in carrying out his chairing responsibilities (including in ruling on the conduct of debate under Standing Order 37) and, if necessary, in updating the Planning Protocol. It is not envisaged that any other governance issues within the remit of Policy and Resources Committee and/or Court of Common Council will arise from that informal consultation, (subject to Recommendation 4 being agreed).

5. Consideration has also been given to how greater focus can be given by Planning and Transportation Committee to strategic and policy issues, and to the governance issues raised by Regulation 10 (which has recently required Sub-committees to be established on an ad hoc basis). These issues and potential ways forward are explored below.
6. Standing Order 27 allows any Committee to constitute Sub-committees subject to approval of Policy and Resources Committee. However, noting the scope of this report and the high profile remit of the proposed Sub-committee, it is considered appropriate to seek the endorsement of Court of Common Council to all the recommended proposals. At its meeting of 7 July 2022 Policy and Resources Committee agreed that its approval of the proposals in this report be delegated to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee, subject to the report being first circulated to members of Policy and Resources Committee for comment. Following circulation feedback was received concerning the potential for the Sub-committee membership to be altered without reference to Court of Common Council, as a result of which it was decided to bring this report back to Policy and Resources Committee rather than act under the delegation. In further response, Recommendation 3 of this report has been added to address this concern.

### **Regulation 10**

7. The Planning and Transportation Committee has responsibility for managing certain land and buildings including City Walkway, Car Parks and highways. As such, planning applications involving development of those areas cannot be determined by Planning and Transportation Committee due to Regulation 10 (Applications which involve minor adjustments of highway boundary and/or Stopping Up Orders to accommodate a new building footprint are not generally regarded as being subject to Regulation 10).
8. The options as to how this can be addressed are below:

Option	Comments	Recommended/Not Recommended
<p>1. Continue establishing ad hoc committees as required</p>	<p>Cumbersome and requires additional committee reports and decisions on each occasion to establish a Subcommittee</p> <p>Three applications requiring a Subcommittee have arisen recently (Fleet House, London Wall Car Park and John Wesley Highwalk) and several others are likely in the near future</p> <p>Ineffective use of officer and member resource</p>	<p>Not Recommended</p>
<p>2. Establish a Planning Applications Committee</p>	<p>This addresses the ineffective use of resources resulting from Option 1</p> <p>The Lisvane Governance Review advocated fewer Committees and Subcommittees, however, the practical implications of addressing Regulation 10 were outside the scope of the Review, and this requirement was therefore not addressed. It is considered to justify a new Committee.</p> <p>This option also addresses the Review's aspiration that P&amp;T Committee give greater focus to strategic and policy decisions</p> <p>However, SO 26 states that a new committee would need its terms of reference approved by the court, and SO 21 provides that the annual appointment of committees takes place at the first regular meeting of the Court in April of each year. A Planning Applications Committee could not therefore be established until April 2023</p>	<p>Not Recommended</p>
<p>3. Establish a Planning Applications Sub-Committee</p>	<p>This addresses the ineffective use of resources resulting from Option 1</p> <p>The Lisvane Governance Review advocated fewer Committees and Subcommittees, however, the practical implications of addressing Regulation 10 were outside the scope of the Review, however, the practical implications of addressing Regulation 10 were outside the scope of the Review, and this</p>	<p>Recommended</p>

	<p>requirement was therefore not addressed. It is considered to justify a new Committee.</p> <p>This option also addresses the Review's aspiration that P&amp;T Committee give greater focus to strategic and policy decisions</p> <p>Planning application decisions must be guided by the strategy and policy work of the P&amp;T Committee. It is therefore considered appropriate for the applications to be considered by a Sub-committee rather than a separate committee</p> <p>A Sub-committee could be established without having to wait for the April 2023 Court of Common Council meeting</p>	
--	--	--

**Focus on Strategic and Policy Matters**

- 9. The vast majority of Planning and Transportation Committee's time is currently taken up with considering planning applications. Other agenda items appear lower down the Agenda (because of the large number of external attendees interested in the planning application items). It is not uncommon for the other agenda items to be considered after a long period of deliberation on the planning application items. The meetings often have to be extended to enable business to be concluded. This risks leaving limited time for other matters, including important matters of strategy and policy that merit great focus and attention because they set the framework for the exercise of the City's planning, highways and traffic functions.
- 10. It is considered that establishing a separate Planning Applications Sub-Committee would enable the Planning and Transportation Committee to give greater focus and attention to strategy and policy issues

**Proposals**

- 11. It is proposed that the membership, Chairmanship and Deputy Chairmanship of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee should be the same as the Planning and Transportation Committee. This will ensure that the Planning Applications [Sub-]committee fully benefits from the training and knowledge of the Planning and Transportation Committee particularly regarding the strategic and policy framework to be applied in deciding planning applications.
- 12. It is proposed that the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meets on a three weekly cycle to enable planning applications to be decided within the statutory timeframes (or extended periods agreed with applicants) to avoid delay in processing applications

13. It is proposed that the Planning and Transportation Committee meet quarterly, supported by a robust and transparent Agenda planning process, to deal with all business other than planning applications.
14. It is proposed that the arrangements for public speaking by applicants and objectors remain as currently set out in the Planning Protocol. The Planning Protocol would, however, require updating to reflect the new arrangements. Planning Protocol updates have previously been reviewed and agreed by Policy and Resources Committee as a precautionary approach noting that Committee's remit for policy and governance matters. However, noting that the Planning Protocol largely deals with housekeeping and advice specific to planning applications (and within the framework of the Member Code of Conduct) it is proposed that it be confirmed that this is within the remit of Planning and Transportation Committee and that future updates to the Planning Protocol be approved by Planning and Transportation Committee.
15. (It should be noted that the Separation of Functions arrangements will continue to operate in parallel with the Regulation 10 requirements, whether or not the proposals are adopted. As set out in the Planning Protocol<sup>4</sup>, this prevents Members of Planning and Transportation Committee who are also involved as Members of a Committee promoting a proposal from participating in the decision on a planning application for the proposal.)

### **Financial Implications**

See "Resource Implications"

### **Resource Implications**

The establishment of a new Sub-Committee is likely to involve modest additional officer resource. Officers would aim to dovetail meetings of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee with those of the Grand Committee as far as possible, to streamline attendance and minimise any additional resource requirements. There would be no addition to the overall level of business. It is considered that the implications can therefore be accommodated within existing resources.

### **Legal Implications**

These are included in the body of the report and non-public report addendum

**Risk Implications** - none

**Equalities Implications** - none

**Climate Implications** - none

**Security Implications** - none

---

<sup>4</sup> Part 4 Paragraph 8e

## **Conclusion**

16. The arrangements proposed in this report for considering planning applications (other than those delegated to officers) and for exercising the functions of Planning and Transportation Committee are aimed at enabling those functions to be more effectively discharged and are recommended.

## **Conclusion**

Appendix 1 – Legal Implications (NON PUBLIC)

Deborah Cluett

Assistant City Solicitor

E: [Deborah.cluett@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Deborah.cluett@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

# Agenda Item 6

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Date</b>
Policy and Resources Committee	4 October 2022
<b>Subject:</b> Appointment of Lead Members (Policy Areas)	<b>Public</b>
Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?	1 - 12
<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> Town Clerk & Chief Executive	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Polly Dunn, Principal Governance and Member Services Manager	

## Summary

One of the outcomes of the recent Governance Review process was endorsement for the principle of a greater use of Lead Members (or 'rapporteurs') on the Policy & Resources Committee in particular. This was intended to help spread the burden of office placed upon the Chairman amongst the wider committee, whilst also making best use of talent available on the Committee.

At its July meeting, the Policy & Resources Committee agreed that the creation of Lead Member portfolios gives a wider array of Members the opportunity to develop in-depth knowledge of certain areas.

On this basis, a generic job description (Appendix 1) and criteria (Appendix 2) were approved. Proposals included five initial areas for leads: Emerging 'High Growth' Markets, Advanced Markets, Sustainability, Innovation in Technology, and SMEs. Delegated authority was also granted for the Town Clerk to consider the development of a similar set of criteria for a "Sports Engagement" lead, and this was approved under urgency procedures shortly thereafter and are also featured on appendix 2.

Expressions of interests for the six roles were sought from the Court. These have been collated and presented to a panel comprised of the Chairman, Deputy Chairman and Vice Chairmen who have considered all nominations advised by Officers based upon the statements submitted by the candidates'. This report presents the outcome of those deliberations for the Committee's final approval.

## Recommendation

Following an application process endorsed by the Committee at its meeting in July 2022, Members are asked to review and appoint the recommended candidates to the various Lead Policy roles, as detailed in the report, for a term ending in May 2023.

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. With general proposals for Lead Members firmly established within a comprehensive Governance Review of the City Corporation, undertaken by Robert Rodgers, The Lord Lisvane, a detailed proposal on how this concept would work was brought forward for the Policy & Resources Committee in July 2022.
2. Members were informed that there were five initial areas that could benefit from the support of a designated Lead Member. These were: Emerging 'High Growth' Markets, Advanced Markets, Sustainability, Innovation in Technology, and SMEs. At the meeting, Members felt that a further portfolio should be trialled for Sports Engagement and as such a Delegated Authority was granted to the Town Clerk to consider and approve criteria for this role. Once the Sports Engagement lead criteria was approved, officers then progressed with advertising the roles as requested by the Committee.
3. On 25 July 2022, an email went to the entire membership of the Court of Common Council advertising the positions. The email included a summary of the roles available, with the job description, set of criteria and links to the original reports. Members were encouraged to speak to contact the Town Clerk or the Chairman for more information about the various vacancies. Members were asked to submit a supporting statement of no more than 300 words, with a deadline for responses set at 19 August 2022. This allowed more than three weeks to respond and a reminder was issued on 16 August 2022.

### **Current Position**

4. A total of 18 Members applied for the six roles. Nominations were received as follows:

#### Innovation in Technology

Deputy Madush Gupta  
Alderman Tim Levene

#### Emerging/High Growth Markets

Deputy Shravan Joshi

#### Advanced Markets

Alderman Prem Goyal  
Alderswoman Susan Langley  
Alderman Bronek Masojada

#### SMEs

Deputy Rehana Ameer  
Aaron D'Souza  
Paul Singh

#### Sports Engagement



Aaron D'Souza  
John Griffiths  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Alpa Raja  
Deputy Philip Woodhouse

Sustainability

Deputy Keith Bottomley  
Alderman & Sheriff Alison Gowman  
Alderman Prem Goyal  
Irem Yerdelen

5. As agreed by the Committee, the next stage was for the Panel (comprised of the Chairman, Deputy Chairman and Vice Chairmen) to review the various supporting statements in consultation with officers in the relevant specialist areas. A meeting was convened on Friday 2 September 2022 for this purpose and this report sets out the Panel's final recommendations for the appointments, which are ultimately to be made by this Committee.
6. At the meeting, the Chairman reminded colleagues of the job descriptions and provided an overview of how the Leads would contribute to advancing and promoting the work of the City of London Corporation. He noted that the newly recruited Head of Policy Unit within the Policy Chairman's Office would work closely with the Policy Leads in order to facilitate this but, as new positions, in practice there would be clarification regarding the scope of these particular roles. For each portfolio it will be key that there is a strategy articulated which will inform our policy/policies.
7. As with all Member roles, there can be no legal executive or decision-making power vested in these posts, nor would the removal of responsibility from the Committee be appropriate in any event. Rather, the roles are intended to act in a more advisory and facilitative capacity, strengthening the collaborative approach between Members and Officers at an early stage as well as during the delivery phase, so as to provide for greater advice, guidance and scrutiny in between meetings.
8. The Chairman agreed to convene an initial meeting of those appointed to formally agree the scope and expectations of those appointed to these roles.
9. In their deliberations, Members were asked to consider equitable representation between Alderman/Common Council representatives, BAME representation, and gender.
10. The following candidates are consequently recommended for appointment:

**Innovation in Technology**

**Criteria:** Experience in working in Innovation in Financial and Professional Services and/or as an investor in any Tech sector.

**Recommended candidate:** Deputy Madush Gupta

Deputy Gupta has first-hand experience in innovation in the FPS sector and his statement demonstrated that he is familiar with newly emerging regulatory challenges within the sector (i.e. blockchain).

### **Emerging/High Growth Markets**

**Criteria:** Experience in working in Financial and Professional Services in any emerging or high growth market.

**Recommended candidate:** Deputy Shravan Joshi  
Deputy Joshi fulfils the appointment criteria.

### **Advanced Markets**

**Criteria:** Senior experience of working in Financial and Professional services with or in COLC target markets of US/Canada, Europe, China or Japan

**Recommended candidate:** Alderwoman Susan Langley  
Alderwoman Langley demonstrated significant senior level experience in FPS, coupled with strong experience working alongside HMG

### **SMEs**

**Criteria:** Experience in working in or with SMEs, investing in SMEs and/or Communications

**Recommended candidate:** Paul Singh  
A serial entrepreneur, Mr. Singh demonstrates a broad understanding of the challenges affecting SMEs

### **Sports Engagement**

**Criteria:** Experience of working in elite or grassroots sport governance, preferably at board level, and a general interest in a diverse range of sports at all levels

**Recommended candidate:** Deputy Edward Lord  
Deputy Lord demonstrated more than 10 years of experience at Board and working level within the amateur and elite sport level

### **Sustainability<sup>+</sup>**

**Criteria:** Experience in Sustainability within Financial or Professional Services and/or Communications Committee experience in Port Health, Planning and Transport, Financial Investment Board, Open Spaces or Property Investment Board or Operational Property and Projects Sub Committee. Understanding of Sustainable Finance or Infrastructure with or in CoLC target markets of US/Canada, Europe, China or Japan

**Recommended candidate:** Deputy Keith Bottomley  
Deputy Bottomley has extensive experience building coalitions and advocating sustainability policy on behalf of the CoLC.

*<sup>+</sup>Deputy Keith Bottomley recused himself from the Panel for this discussion.*

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

#### **Corporate and Strategic Implications**

15. *Financial and Resource implications* – There would be no direct financial implications, however there may be additional resource implications in terms of administrative and briefing support for these Members.

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

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

*Risk implications* – There is always an inherent risk that, despite the individual Lead Member’s best intentions, their interpretation of the Committee’s wishes might not reflect accurately the majority view. However, the absence of any executive decision-making powers and the requirement for any and all Member

decisions to continue to come to Committee in the usual way will mitigate against this risk and provide no greater risk than officers operating with lesser Member guidance or advice.

*Security implications* – none.

### **Conclusion**

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

### **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 – Policy Leads Job Description
- Appendix 2 – Policy Leads Criteria

### **Background Report:**

[Lead Members \(Policy Areas\)](#) – Policy & Resources Committee (July 2022)

[Governance Review](#) – Court of Common Council (December 2021)

### **Polly Dunn**

Principal Governance and Member Services Manager

E: [Polly.Dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Polly.Dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

## Policy Leads - Job Description

### Appointment

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

### Overall Responsibilities

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

### Main Tasks and Responsibilities

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

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

**Policy Areas: Eligibility Requirements / Criteria**

<b>Policy Area</b>	<b>Eligibility Requirements / Criteria</b>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience in Sustainability within Financial or Professional Services and/or Communications</li> <li>• Committee experience in Port Health, Planning and Transport, Financial Investment Board, Open Spaces or PIB / or OPPSC</li> <li>• Understanding of Sustainable Finance or Infrastructure with or in COLC target markets of US/Canada, Europe, China or Japan</li> </ul>
<b>SMEs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience in working in or with SMEs, investing in SMEs and/or Communications</li> </ul>
<b>Emerging/ High Growth Markets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience in working in Financial and Professional Services in any emerging or high growth market</li> </ul>
<b>Innovation in Technology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience in working in Innovation in Financial and Professional Services and/or as an investor in any Tech sector</li> </ul>
<b>Advanced Markets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senior experience of working in Financial and Professional services with or in COLC target markets of US/Canada, Europe, China or Japan</li> </ul>
<b>Sports Engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience of working in elite or grassroots sport governance, preferably at board level, and a general interest in a diverse range of sports at all levels</li> </ul>

# Agenda Item 7

<b>Committee(s)</b>	<b>Dated:</b>
Policy and Resources Committee	4 October 2022
<b>Subject:</b> Nomination to the Board of Governors of the Museum of London	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	3; 4a-b; 10d
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	No
<b>If so, how much?</b>	N/A
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	N/A
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	N/A
<b>Report of:</b> Town Clerk	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Jayne Moore, Town Clerk's Department	

## Summary

This report sets out the background to the appointment of external candidates to the Board of Governors of the Museum of London and recommends Charlotte Twyning for appointment as a City of London Corporation Governor of the Museum for a four-year term.

## Recommendation

The Policy and Resources Committee is asked to confirm the appointment of Charlotte Twyning as a City of London Corporation Governor of the Museum of London for a four-year term ending 15 September 2026.

## Main Report

### Background

1. Under the provisions of the Greater London Authority Act 2007, the Greater London Authority and the City of London Corporation each appoints nine Governors to the Board of Governors of the Museum of London. Of the City of London Corporation's nine appointments, six are elected by the Court of Common Council and three are external appointments (one of which is made available to London Councils to make a nomination).
2. The Court of Common Council has delegated authority to the Policy and Resources Committee to appoint external candidates to the Board of Governors of the Museum of London, as recommended by the Policy & Resources Committee meeting of 21 February 2008, and approved by the Court of Common Council at the meeting of 06 March 2008.
3. External candidates appointed to the Board of Governors by the City of London Corporation are typically granted terms of four years.

## **Current Position**

4. A vacancy for a third City of London Corporation external appointment exists on the Board of Governors of the Museum of London (the other two being the recently-appointed Professor Sir David Cannadine, and Councillor Kaya Comer-Schwartz representing London Councils).
5. Charlotte Twyning brings extensive knowledge of major project delivery and stakeholder management, as well as board experience.
6. The recruitment process agreed with the City of London Corporation was followed: the position was advertised publicly, and the interview panel included the Board of Governors Chair (Clive Bannister), the Museum Director, and an independent observer. A second interview was conducted with the Policy & Resources Committee Vice-Chair (and Museum Governor) Tijs Broeke.

## **Appendix**

- CV and application of Charlotte Twyning.

### **Jayne Moore**

Town Clerk's Department

E: [jayne.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:jayne.moore@cityoflondon.gov.uk)



By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee(s):</b> Policy and Resources Committee – For Decision	<b>Dated:</b> 04/10/2022
<b>Subject:</b> Corporation representation on the Green Finance Institute Board	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	7,8
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</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> Director of Innovation and Growth	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Simon Burns, Innovation and Growth	

## Summary

The Green Finance Institute (GFI) was launched in 2019 with the Corporation as a majority funder, alongside HM Government. With this came an entitlement for the Corporation to appoint GFI board seats. Board Membership now needs to be updated.

## Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to confirm the Corporation’s two GFI board members: Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee and Simon Duckworth until September 2023, then Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee and Deputy Chairman of Policy and Resource Committee thereafter.

## Main Report

### Background

1. Since 2019 the City Corporation and GFI have worked together to deliver on the mutual goals of greening finance and financing green. The intended impacts of this partnership are to ensure financial and professional services (FPS) firms can deliver on critical global environmental objectives and to anchor the relevant expertise in the UK. As one of the GFI’s founding supporters, the Corporation has provided funding to the GFI since its inception.
2. Since 2019 the GFI has grown its headcount, range of projects, and range of funding sources considerably. The GFI updated its Articles of Association (Articles) earlier this year to reflect this development. The new Articles detail that:
  - The Corporation has the right to appoint up to two Directors (previously three); and
  - The Corporation will no longer be the only member of GFI. The other non-CoLC Directors will join CoLC as Members of the company.

3. These changes reflected best practice in corporate governance. They also removed any potential for the perception of undue influence by the Corporation on the GFI's strategic decisions.
4. Under the terms of the new Articles, it is recommended that the Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee continues to occupy one GFI board seat, alongside a Deputy.
5. To ensure continuity, it is recommended that Simon Duckworth maintain his seat on the board until September 2023. This takes account of Simon's work supporting the GFI's quarterly risk reviews. In September 2023, Simon would stand down to be replaced by the Deputy Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee, who would assume the Corporation's second GFI board seat.

### **Current Position**

6. Under the previous Articles the three members currently on the GFI's board were Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee, Simon Duckworth, and Alison Gowman.

### **Options**

7. Members may choose to approve the Corporation's GFI board members.

### **Proposal(s)**

8. The recommended Board membership ensures continuity and continued effectiveness in representing the Corporation's interests.

### **Key Data**

9. None

### **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

**Strategic implications** – Supporting innovation in the FPS sector is a priority under the Thriving Economy pillar of the Corporate Plan. By confirming our two board members we are committing to support a real hub of green innovation in the UK, in the GFI.

**Financial implications** – None.

**Resource implications** – None

**Legal implications** – None

**Risk implications** – None

**Equalities implications** – None

**Climate implications** - The work of the GFI enables the development of innovative climate-positive financial products. By supporting the GFI we are indirectly facilitating positive climate outcomes.

**Security implications**- None

## **Conclusion**

10. Members are asked to approve the Corporation's two GFI Board members. They will continue to provide strategic input and guidance to the GFI on behalf of the Corporation.

Simon Burns, Head of Sustainable Finance Innovation, Innovation & Growth

T: +44(0) 7514 979114

E: [Simon.burns@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Simon.burns@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee(s):</b> Policy & Resources Committee	<b>Dated:</b> 04 October 2022
<b>Subject:</b> Freedom Applications Sub-Committee Composition and Access	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation's Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	3, 10
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>£NA</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>Report of:</b> The Town Clerk & Chief Executive	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author:</b> Polly Dunn, Governance and Member Services Manager	

## Summary

This report seeks clarification on two areas of governance concerning the Freedom Applications Sub-Committee (FASC). The first relates to its composition of the Freedom Applications Sub-Committee and the eligibility of those who may stand for vacancies. The second seeks the Committee's approval to hold future FASC meetings entirely in non-public session.

## Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

- confirm the Freedom Application Sub-Committee's Terms of Reference and composition;
- approve any consequent changes to the terms of reference; and
- agree that, as a private function of the City of London Corporation not subject to subject to the provisions of Part VA and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, future meetings of the FASC be held exclusively in private session.

## Main Report

### Background

1. In December 2021, the Court of Common Council received and approved the final recommendations made in response to The Lord Lisvane's Governance Review.
2. One of the recommendations related to the Freedom Applications Committee (FAC), a Grand Committee that is responsible for examining and reporting back on any applications for the Freedom referred to it by the Court of Common

Council. Given this specific and focussed remit, it was suggested that FAC cease to be a Grand Committee and become a Sub-Committee of Policy & Resources.

3. Whilst Members considered including the responsibilities of FAC into the new Civic Affairs Sub-Committee, the Court agreed that it should be its own distinct sub of Policy & Resources. At its meeting on 5 May 2022, the Policy & Resources Committee then agreed to delegate this responsibility by establishing the Freedom-Applications Sub-Committee (FASC) in almost identical terms as its previous form (FAC).
4. As seen in Appendix 1, the existing composition of FASC includes
  - two Members elected by the Court of Common Council, at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment
5. The vacancy in question relates to this fourth bullet. When first constituting FASC Policy & Resources agreed that (for one year only) it would directly appoint the current serving Court Members, to provide continuity from the previous year. The positions were therefore offered to Tijs Broeke and Dominic Christian. Tijs Broeke then subsequently stepped down and created the vacancy in question.
6. This vacancy was advertised to the whole of the Court of Common Council, for appointment at July Court. We received one nomination but on the day, this nominee withdrew, and a point of order was raised to seek clarification from Policy & Resources Committee on the eligibility of nominees. The vacancy was consequently deferred until such a time that this Committee made clear its view. This report seeks that steer.
7. In conjunction with the above, a further matter involving the FASC has come to light, and also relates to a separate recommendation of the Governance Review: the disapplication of inappropriately treating its non-local authority business under the provisions of local government legislation. This was agreed by Court at its meeting in March 2022, with Standing Order 32 now reading:

### **32. Access to Meetings**

*1. All meetings of Committees and Sub-Committees are open to the public unless:-*

*(a) confidential information as defined in Section 100A(3) of the Local Government Act 1972 is to be discussed; or,*

*(b) a resolution has been passed to exclude the public as there is likely to be disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972;*

*In respect of non-local authority and non-police authority functions this Standing Order is not applied unless a Committee or Sub-Committee determines otherwise.*

8. It has been brought to our attention that in practice, due to the nature of decisions being made, the FASC is conducted entirely in Non-Public session save for the



opening of the meeting and the agreement to exclude the public. It has therefore been suggested that, in order to streamline the conduct of the meeting and, pursuant to the Governance Review recommendations, it would be beneficial for Policy & Resources to agree that FASC may be conducted exclusively in private session.

## **Current Position**

### Composition

9. The current terms of reference and composition of FASC are found at appendix 1 and the confusion that has arisen is two fold.
10. The first consideration involves aldermanic representation. Given that there are two places on FASC specifically allocated to Alderman, does the Committee feel that Aldermen should also be permitted to stand for the wider Court vacancies? Usual practice across committees typically permits aldermen to nominate themselves for vacancies in the absence of any Common Councillors stepping forward.
11. The second matter involves the criterion that one of the two wider Court positions be reserved for a Member that has served a term on the Court of fewer than five years. Where this requirement exists, should the vacancy be readvertised when no 'new' Members have expressed an interest, but a longer-serving Member has, or should the nomination be accepted?
12. Whilst the Policy & Resources Committee can make a discrete, isolated decision on these matters, that only applies to FASC, Members may wish to consider whether they would like these principles to apply across its other sub committees.
13. The following sub-committees also have distinct places reserved for Aldermen (e.g. Chairman of GP or their nominee) within their composition, but could also have Aldermen appointed by the Court of Common Council: Communications & Corporate Affairs Sub; Civic Affairs Sub; Equality Diversity & Inclusion Sub; and Capital Buildings Board.
14. No other sub-committee of Policy involves a composition that stipulates a maximum term length for one or more of its membership, but other Grand Committees, do.

### Public Access

15. Having sought the advice of the Comptroller & City Solicitor, it has been determined that the work undertaken by FASC constitutes a non-local authority function. Following enquiries from Members, the Committee's views are therefore also sought on the cessation of the public element of formal FASC meetings.
16. Recent FASC meetings have only had the following items of business in public session: Apologies; Declarations; Public Minutes; Outstanding Actions; Questions; Any other Business; Exclusion of the Public. The rest of the substantive meeting takes place in Non-Public Session. As per the recent recordings of meetings, the average time of public session has been c.10

minutes and in terms of content, provides minimal public interest (20-30 views per video).

17. In order to facilitate a livestream, we have to ensure there are two Members of the Governance and Member Services staff present. There is also a need to produce two agendas and two sets of minutes (one public, one non-public). Consequently, a move towards a private meeting would somewhat reduce the demand on Members' time and would facilitate a small saving in staff resource.

## **Options**

18. With respect to the FASC composition, Members have the following options:
- i. to leave the terms of reference unchanged, without further clarification. This course of action (or, rather, inaction) may lead to continued issues of interpretation and is therefore not recommended.
  - ii. to provide a steer as to whether Aldermen and (where applicable) Members with more than five years of service, should be able to stand for the FASC vacancies advertised to the whole Court of Common Council. This clarification can be incorporated into its Terms of Reference.
  - iii. to consider applying the same interpretation of aldermanic eligibility across each of its sub-committees. This would mean that, where Aldermen have reserved places, they may not stand for vacancies arising for the wider Court. This option will have implications to existing memberships.
19. In regard to access to FASC meetings, Members may choose to continue as they do at present, with a public and non-public section. Alternatively, they may support a move toward an entirely non-public meeting arrangement.

## **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

Strategic implications – This report seeks to clarify the Committee's position to changes implemented in response to the Governance Review, which was commissioned to help the City Corporation to better deliver against its Corporate Strategy through its decision-making and Committee systems.

Financial implications – There are no financial implications beyond resourcing (see below).

Resource implications – There will be some small resource savings in staff time if a decision is taken to cease public access to FASC meetings.

Legal implications – It has been confirmed with the Comptroller & City Solicitor that there are no legal implications to ending public access to FASC meetings. There are no legal implications to the decision taken on FASC composition.

Risk implications – there are no implications.

Equalities implications – Under the Equality Act 2010, all public bodies have a duty to ensure that when exercising their functions they have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and to take steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people and encourage people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where their participation is disproportionately

low. The proposals contained in this report do not have any potential negative impact on a particular group of people based on their protected characteristics.

Climate implications – There are no implications.

Security implications – There are no implications.

## **Conclusion**

20. The Committee's views are sought on the eligibility of Court Members for a position on the Freedom Applications Sub-Committee and on the public accessibility of the same sub-committee.

## **Appendices**

- Appendix 1 – Terms of Reference of the Freedom Applications Sub-Committee

## **Background Papers**

- [Governance Review](#) – Court of Common Council (December 2021)
- [Appointment of Committees](#) – Policy & Resources Committee (May 2022)

## **Polly Dunn**

Principal Governance and Member Services Manager

E: [Polly.Dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:Polly.Dunn@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

**Freedom Applications Sub-Committee**

**Composition**

- the Chairman and the Deputy or Vice Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee (or a nominee of each Member)
- two Aldermen nominated by the Court of Aldermen
- one Member of the Policy and Resources Committee, appointed by that Committee
- two Members elected by the Court of Common Council, at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment
- the following ex-officio Members:-
  - the Chief Commoner
  - The immediate past Chief Commoner until the election by Common Council of his or her successor
  - The Chief Commoner designate once elected by Common Council

The Chairman to be Chairman of Policy & Resources or their nominee.

**Terms of Reference**

- a) To examine and report back on any applications for the Freedom referred to the Committee by the Court of Common Council.
- b) To consider informally any non-livery nominations that may be referred to it, prior to their submission to the Court of Common Council.
- c) To examine, consider, and report back on issues concerning the rules and principles relating to, and criteria for, the Freedom;
- d) To consider matters relating to the general use of the Freedom, such as for City of London Corporation policy objectives;
- e) To consider, and to provide guidance to Members of the Court of Common Council, and Livery Companies, on, the criteria for and processes relating to the award of the Freedom; and
- f) To consider matters relating to the Honorary Freedom.

This page is intentionally left blank

<b>Committee(s):</b> Policy and Resources Committee – For decision	<b>Dated:</b> 04/10/2022
<b>Subject: Financial Services Skills Commission</b>	<b>Public</b>
<b>Which outcomes in the City Corporation’s Corporate Plan does this proposal aim to impact directly?</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>If so, how much?</b>	<b>£95k (max) per year for three years</b>
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	<b>Section 106 ringfenced funding</b>
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Report of: Executive Director of Innovation and Growth</b>	<b>For Decision</b>
<b>Report author: Sophie Hulm, Innovation and Growth</b>	

## Summary

The Financial Services Skills Commission launched in 2020, in partnership with TheCityUK and the City Corporation. It aims to increase the supply of talent, with the required skills, to the UK’s financial services sector. It is the output of the Government sponsored Financial Services Skills Taskforce. In May 2020, the Court of Common Council and your Committee agreed the City Corporation’s position as a Permanent Founding Member (along with TheCityUK) and a seat on the Commission’s Board. The Board recently approved an extension to the Commission’s original three-year lifespan (from April 2023). Since launch, The City Corporation has provided a membership fee (£20k pa) as well as seconding its Head of Skills Policy Claire Tunley as CEO of the Commission.

Members are asked to confirm the City Corporation’s continued support of the Financial Services Skills Commission for a further three years. This would be funded by section 106 moneys which can only be used for skills work.

## Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to:

Approve the release of planning obligation funds, ringfenced for skills work, to provide an ongoing membership contribution (£20k pa) for three years (2023/24-2025/26) and delegate authority to the Town Clerk to decide the exact nature of additional support (capped at £75k pa) over the coming three years (2023/24-2025/26) beyond the membership fee.

## **Main Report**

### **Background**

1. The Financial Services Skills Taskforce was announced by the Chancellor in his Mansion House speech in June 2018. It was established to look at the current and future skills needs of the UK's financial services sector, in response to unprecedented technological change and disruption.
2. The taskforce was chaired by Mark Hoban and led by TheCityUK, with support from the City Corporation. Its recommendations included the need for financial services firms to collaborate on skills. The Financial Services Skills Commission was created in 2020 to facilitate this. The Commission now has 36 paying members across UK financial services, and has in the past two years delivered:
  - A common skills framework for the sector, identifying priority skills where firms are facing acute shortages
  - A business case for reskilling, identifying the cost savings that firms can make from investing in reskilling employees
  - A practical guide to measuring inclusion, a key part of fostering a positive working culture.
  - Research into the skills challenges across the UK's regions and nations, delivering in partnership with the Professional Business Services Council and the City Corporation.
  - Research into the impact of the menopause on women's participation in work.
3. As agreed by the Court of Common Council (May 2020) and your Committee, the City Corporation is one of two Permanent Founding Members, along with TheCityUK. This involves your Chairman representing the City Corporation on the Board of the Commission, access to all the work of the Commission, an annual membership subscription of £20k (in line with other members) and secondment of the City Corporation's Head of Skills to the Commission as their CEO.

### **Current Position**

4. In March 2022, The Commission's Board approved an extension to the Commission's original three-year lifespan, beyond March 2023. This decision was informed by an independent effectiveness review. Over the coming months, the Board will decide whether the life of the Commission should continue for two years or three years.
5. Support from industry is strong, NatWest, Zurich, Lloyds Bank, Standard Chartered Bank, Direct Line Group, Phoenix Group, HSBC, Barclays, Nationwide, London Stock Exchange Group, Financial Services Compensation Scheme, Capital One, Danske Bank, PWC & EY are represented on the board.



## **Proposals**

6. The City Corporation is an agreed permanent member of the Commission. As the Commission's life has been extended, beyond its originally planned three years, Officers propose that the City Corporation extends its support for a further three years. As referenced in paragraph 4, if the Board decide to extend for two years rather than three, City Corporation support would only be required for two years.
7. The Commission's work closely aligns with the City Corporation's skills priorities and Competitiveness Strategy. Our involvement has enhanced our impact and leadership on skills. With established expertise via the skills teams in IG and DCCS, we are also able contribute to the success of the Commission, as well as benefit from its work.
8. Support for the skills body is proposed as:
  - a) Membership of the body - £20k per year for three years.
  - b) Contributing expertise to workstreams, drawing on our experience and leading practice on employability, skills, education and training.
  - c) Financial support, matched by TheCityUK, to support core costs, specific projects, workstreams or research e.g. on ESG skills – capped at £75k per year for up to three years. This would replace the existing CEO secondment arrangement.
9. This proposal represents a 14% reduction from the previous three years of support. Resourcing of the City Corporation's support can be met from Section 106 funding, ringfenced for skills work (see Appendix 1).
10. As the Commission's exact business plan for 2023 onwards is still under development, we are unable to specify the exact nature of this support. Therefore, Members are asked to delegate responsibility for final agreement to the Town Clerk.

## **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

### **Financial Implications**

12. The 2022/23 opening balance of Section 106 receipts is £1.2m. Officers are confident that this balance will increase by a further £1.23m this year. This income is expected to come from City developments that have already commenced (planning permission granted and works started). Our planning policies restrict the use of these funds to investment in skills, training and job brokerage.
13. In October 2021 your Committee agreed the release of £1.23m of Section 106 funds ringfenced for skills work in 2022/23 – 2024/25. Funding to support the Commission for a further three years is on top of this allocation. The existing £1.23m allocation primarily covers three years of staff salaries, to deliver the Skills

for a Sustainable Skyline Taskforce, chaired by your Committee Chairman, and a Government commissioned taskforce to boost socio-economic diversity. No additional costs will be incurred to Corporation budgets.

### **Strategic Implications**

14. The proposal in this report aligns to the “Supporting a thriving economy” pillar of the Corporate Plan. By focusing on inclusion and growth through talent and skills development, it also supports “Businesses are trusted and socially and environmentally responsible”. It also aligns with the “World Class Business Environment” objective in the Competitiveness Strategy.
15. Investment in skills and training is supported by the adopted City of London Local Plan and the emerging draft City Plan 2036, providing a framework for further developer contributions.

### **Resource Implications**

16. Innovation and Growth’s Skills Policy team is focused on two significant projects, a taskforce to boost socio-economic diversity and a taskforce to boost green skills in the commercial built environment. Terminating our partnership with the Commission could result in resource implications, as the team would need to respond to financial services related skills policy issues, as opposed to forwarding to the Commission.

### **Equalities Implications**

17. Positive. The Commission has a work strand on diversity and inclusion.

### **Climate Implications**

18. Positive. The Commission is exploring a work strand on ESG skills.

### **Risk Implications**

19. Reputational risk of not continuing the partnership, given strong industry support. In 2020, your committee committed, alongside TheCityUK, to being a Permanent Founding Member.

### **Legal Implications**

20. Our planning policies restrict the use of these funds to investment in skills, training and job brokerage.

### **Conclusion**

21. This proposal relates to allocation of Section 106 receipts that are already earmarked for employability, skills and training. Committee approval would

enable the City Corporation to play a central part in work to support skills in the financial services sector.

## **Appendices**

### Appendix 1

- Section 106 Skills Funding

### Appendix 2

- Financial Services Skills Commission impact / outputs

## **Background Papers**

Report to Court of Common Council “Report – Policy & Resources Committee.  
Report of Urgent Action Taken: Financial Services Skills Commission” (May 2020)

Report to Policy & Resources Committee “Future Skills and Talent - Strengthening  
IG support for City Competitiveness” (Oct 2021)

Non-Public report to Policy & Resources Committee “Financial Services Skills  
Taskforce” (Nov 2019)

### **Sophie Hulm**

Head of Skills Policy, Innovation and Growth

T: 07834 384 968

E: [sophie.hulm@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:sophie.hulm@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

## Appendix 1

### **Section 106 Skills Funding**

Skills work is resourced via Planning obligations (often called section 106 agreements) funds that are ringfenced for skills work. On 14<sup>th</sup> October 2021, your committee approved the release of three years of section 106 funding to support Innovation and Growth work on skills, in support of the corporate plan. Members are asked to approve an additional allocation (maximum of £95k per year for three years), to enable City Corporation support for the Commission. Members are asked to delegate authority so that the specific nature of this support will be agreed in discussion with the Town Clerk.

As at 01 April 2022, the available Section 106 monies totalled £1,202,945.51. This balance is expected to increase in line with City developments. Any contribution for the Commission will come from these available funds, ringfenced for skills. We are not seeking additional resources outside of these available funds.

In line with City Corporation's Supplementary Planning Document, this funding enables the City Corporation to "*work with partners and neighbouring boroughs to promote employability, provide jobs and growth and deliver a diverse and inclusive workforce.*" Reporting on the impact of the Commission will be through the City Corporation's Annual Monitoring Report.

## Appendix 2

### **Financial Services Skills Commission impact / outputs**

Practical insights to support ambitions:

- **Future Skills Framework** – identifies the priority skills that members have acute shortages or growing demand. It provides a consistent set of definitions and proficiency levels for these skills. Nearly 2/3 of member firms have adopted or are planning to adopt the framework this year.
- **Reskilling business case** – provides evidence of the cost savings financial services firms can benefit from when they reskill an employee; versus hiring someone new with the relevant skills. This content is being used by 70% of member firms to inform discussions and plans around reskilling.
- **Inclusion Measurement Guide** – supports firms to measure inclusion across three priority areas based on a maturity model, allowing firms to develop their approach. Since the guide was launched 100% of members are measuring inclusion.

Research and insights into issues affecting the supply of talent and skills gaps:

- **Skills for Future Success** - examined the regional and national aspects of skills and is forming part of the conversation in a series of regional roundtables we are holding in the summer and autumn.

- **Staying ahead in a changing world** - identified the skills that leaders need a varied set of skills including understanding ESG, tech transformation as well as an inclusive style of leadership.
- **Menopause in the workplace** – identified that 25% of women more likely to leave the financial services workforce due to menopause experience and provided practical actions that firms can undertake to support women with menopause transition.
- **Inclusion in financial services** - We partnered with the Financial Services Culture Board (FSCB) to undertake a widespread survey of inclusion in the sector, identifying workforce views on topics such as stereotyping, belonging and fear of speaking up.

The impact of the work is starting to become apparent:

- 82% of firms identify and forecast future skills, an increase since 2020
- 73% of firms track the impact of learning and the impact is most evident in terms of staff engagement and satisfaction.
- All firms are now measuring inclusion compared to 83% in 2020, some members have seen an increase in visits to the recruitment pages of their website coinciding with positive action on D&I.
- Our work has received support from key stakeholders including HM Treasury, FCA, and industry bodies, such as UK Finance, ABI and CIPD.

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) 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank