Public Document Pack

CITY OF LONDON

Policy and Resources Committee

Date: **THURSDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 2025**

Time: 1.45 pm

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

Members:
Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)
Deputy James Thomson CBE (Deputy Chair)
Tijs Broeke (Vice-Chair)
Deputy Caroline Haines (Vice-Chair)
Munsur Ali
Shahnan Bakth (Ex-Officio Member)
Brendan Barns (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Emily Benn
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Deputy Henry Colthurst (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Peter Dunphy (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Helen Fentimen OBE JP
Steve Goodman OBE
Jason Groves
Alderman Timothy Hailes JP
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson
Deputy Ann Holmes
Shravan Joshi MBE
Alderman Vincent Keaveny, CBE
Florence Keelson-Anfu (Ex-Officio Member)
The Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor
Ald. Alastair King DL (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Paul Martinelli
Alderman Bronek Masojada
Deputy Andrien Meyers
Deputy Alastair Moss
Deputy Benjamin Murphy
Deputy Henry Pollard (Ex-Officio Member)
Alderman Sir William Russell
Deputy Tom Sleigh (Ex-Officio Member)
James Tumbridge
Philip Woodhouse
Irem Yerdelen

Enquiries: **Ben Dunleavy**
ben.dunleavy@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Accessing the virtual public meeting
Members of the public can observe all virtual public meetings of the City of London Corporation by following the below link:
https://www.youtube.com/@CityofLondonCorporation/streams

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

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

Ian Thomas CBE
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

AGENDA

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 meeting held on 3 July 2025 (Pages 9 - 16)

   b) *To note the public summary of the inquorate Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Sub-Committee meeting held on 16 June 2025

   c) *To note the public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 25 June 2025

   d) *To note the draft public minutes of the Capital Buildings Board meeting held on 16 July 2025

   e) *To note the public summary of the Destination Advisory Board meeting held on 11 June 2025

4. **EDI SUB-COMMITTEE NAME CHANGE**

   The Town Clerk to be heard.

   For Decision

5. **SCHEME OF DELEGATIONS – MANAGING DIRECTOR OF CITY BRIDGE FOUNDATION**

   Report of the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation.

   For Decision
   (Pages 17 - 32)

6. **INVESTMENT GOVERNANCE UPDATE**

   Joint Report of the City Surveyor and the Town Clerk.

   For Decision
   (Pages 33 - 38)

7. **APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL INTERNAL MEMBERS TO COMPETITIVENESS ADVISORY BOARD**

Report of the Executive Director, Innovation & Growth.

For Decision
(Pages 39 - 46)

8. **FAITH IN THE CITY**

Report of the Chief Strategy Officer.

For Decision
(Pages 47 - 52)

9. **NORTH EAST LONDON ROUGH SLEEPING PREVENTION AND RECOVERY GRANT DELIVERY PROPOSAL**

Report of the Executive Director, Community and Children's Services Committee.

For Decision
(Pages 53 - 62)

10. **ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PANEL OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision
(Pages 63 - 74)

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

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Information

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

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information

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

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

15. **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

16. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**

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

a) To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2025. (Pages 75 - 82)

b) *To note the non-public summary of the inquorate Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Sub-Committee meeting held on 16 June 2025

c) *To note the non-public minutes of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee meeting held on 24 June 2025

d) *To note the draft non-public minutes of the Capital Buildings Board meeting held on 16 July 2025

e) *To note the draft minutes of the Income Generation Working Party meeting held on 3 July 2025

f) *To note the minutes of the Competitiveness Advisory Board meeting held on 23 July 2025

17. **ADVERTISING INCOME**

Joint Report of the Chamberlain and the Executive Director, Environment.

For Decision
(Pages 83 - 96)

18. **GUILDHALL CHARGING REVIEW**

Report of the Remembrancer.

For Decision
(Pages 97 - 112)

19. **PERMISSION TO LET FORMER LOUGHTON GOLF COURSE, CLAYS LANE, EPPING**

Joint Report of the City Surveyor and the Executive Director, Environment.

For Decision
(Pages 113 - 122)

20. **RESOLUTION FROM THE PENSIONS COMMITTEE**

Resolution from the meeting of the Pensions Committee on 7 July 2025.

For Decision
(Pages 123 - 124)

21. ***MAJOR PROGRAMMES DASHBOARD – SEPTEMBER 2025**

Report of the Chamberlain.

For Information

22. ***REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Information

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

24. **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

25. **MINUTES**

a) *To note the draft confidential minutes of the Capital Buildings Board meeting held on 16 July 2025

b) *To note the draft confidential summary of the inquorate Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Sub-Committee meeting held on 16 June 2025

c) *To note the draft minutes of the Freedom Applications Sub-Committee meeting held on 14 July 2025.

26. **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE AWAY DAY ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

Report of the Town Clerk.

For Decision

27. **AMBITION 25: MY CONTRIBUTION, MY REWARD GATEWAY 1-4**

Report of the Town Clerk & Chief Executive.

For Decision

This page is intentionally left blank

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
Thursday, 3 July 2025

Minutes of the meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Thursday, 3 July 2025 at 1.45 pm

Present

Members:
Deputy Christopher Hayward (Chairman)
Deputy James Thomson CBE (Deputy Chair)
Tijs Broeke (Vice-Chair)
Deputy Caroline Haines (Vice-Chair)
Munsur Ali
Shahnan Bakth (Ex-Officio Member)
Brendan Barns (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Emily Benn
Deputy Keith Bottomley
Deputy Peter Dunphy (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Helen Fentimen OBE JP
Steve Goodman OBE
Jason Groves
Alderman Timothy Hailes JP
Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson
Alderman Vincent Keaveny, CBE
Florence Keelson-Anfu (Ex-Officio Member)
Deputy Paul Martinelli
Alderman Bronek Masojada
Deputy Benjamin Murphy
Deputy Henry Pollard (Ex-Officio Member)
Alderman Sir William Russell
James Tumbridge
Irem Yerdelen

In Attendance

Members:
Deputy Madush Gupta

Officers:

Ian Thomas, CBE	-	Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Gregory Moore	-	Deputy Town Clerk
Caroline Al-Beyerty	-	The Chamberlain
Michael Cogher	-	Comptroller and City Solicitor
Paul Wilkinson	-	City Surveyor
Paul Wright	-	Remembrancer
Damian Nussbaum	-	Director of Innovation & Growth
Judith Finlay	-	Executive Director, Community and Children's Services

Phil Black	-	Chamberlain’s Department
Sonia Virdee	-	Chamberlain’s Department
Chris Bonner	-	City Surveyor’s Department
Peta Caine	-	Community and Children’s Services Department
Bridget O’Dwyer	-	Community and Children’s Services Department
Andrew Impey	-	Environment Department
Polly Dunn	-	Town Clerk's Department
Ben Dunleavy	-	Town Clerk's Department

1. **APOLOGIES**
Apologies for absence were received from Deputy Emily Benn, Deputy Henry Colthurst, Deputy Ann Holmes, Deputy Tom Sleigh and Philip Woodhouse.

Deputy Jaspreet Hodgson observed the meeting virtually

2. **MEMBERS DECLARATIONS UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT IN RESPECT OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**
There were no additional declarations.

3. **MINUTES**
a) To agree the public minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2025
The public minutes and non-public summary of the meeting held on 12 June 2025 were approved as a correct record.

Matters arising
The Chairman noted the Committee’s appointment to the Audit and Risk Management Committee had been advertised twice without attracting any interest from Members. After confirming that no Members wished to represent the Committee on the Committee, he said that the appointment would be left vacant and suggested that it would be helpful for the Audit and Risk Management Committee to consider this element of its composition as part of its annual Terms of Reference review. At a Member’s suggestion, he undertook whether to consider if the vacancy could be advertised to the wider Court.

b) To note the draft public minutes of the Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee meeting held on 29 May 2025
The public minutes and non-public summary of the Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee meeting held on 29 May 2025 were noted.

4. **FRAUD AND CYBER CRIME REPORTING AND ANALYSIS SERVICE PROCUREMENT COMMITTEE - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE**
The Committee received a report of the Deputy Town Clerk concerning Committee composition.

RESOLVED: That Members agree to recommend to the Court of Common Council to alter the Fraud and Cyber Crime Reporting and Analysis Service

Procurement Committee's Terms of Reference to include the addition of a nominee for each Committee that is represented in the membership.

5. **PAN LONDON SUBSTANCE MISUSE PROGRAMME**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director for Community and Children's Services concerning a commissioning role for the City of London Corporation.

A Member noted that there were specific areas in the City where substance misuse was more of a problem and asked what the most effective way to communicate with these areas. In reply, officers said that this could be done through the Director of Public Health and their team and undertook to share further information outside of the meeting.

RESOLVED: That Members approve the City of London Corporation to continue a lead commissioner role of the Pan London Substance Misuse Programme which will include commissioning of an Inpatient Detoxification and Stabilisation (IPD) Framework (via one lead provider) to support a wider cohort of those needing help with substance misuse post 2025/26.

6. **CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE**

The Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain concerning funding for capital projects.

RESOLVED: That Members

i. After reviewing the schemes summarised in Table 1 and, particularly in the context of the current financial climate, confirm their continued essential priority for release of funding at this time and accordingly:

ii. Agree the release of up to £2.05m for the schemes progressing to the next Gateway in Table 1 from City Fund £1.91m (£0.75m from OSPR and £0.78m from CIL) and £0.14m for City Estate.

7. **HOUSING INVESTMENT PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director for Community and Children's Services concerning the Housing Investment Programme.

Introducing the report, the Chairman repeated his comments made at the Court of Common Council meeting on 26 June 2025 that the Housing Investment Programme was a priority for the City Corporation.

The Chairman acknowledged that, at £205million over a 10-year window, the Housing Investment Programme came at a considerable financial cost. However, he said that it was only this large because the City Corporation had historically underinvested in these estates; he felt it was long-past time to make these commitments for residents. He assured Members that the financial outlay would not be immediate or required in one tranche, but phased along with the programme. The commitment for the first five-years of the programme had been made, and the Chairman and other senior Members had recently met with officers to discuss how to procure the remaining funds.

Looking forward, the Chairman informed the Committee that he had asked the Town Clerk to commission a viability assessment of the City Corporation's current estates, identifying the scope for intensification and delivery of new units. He would continue to chair regular update meetings with officers, which would also include the Chairman of the Finance Committee, the Chair of the Investment Committee, the Deputy Chair of the Police & Resources Committee and the Lead Member for Resident Engagement.

During discussion, Members noted that it was important to also consider the needs of residents who lived in non-City Corporation housing, such as the Mansell Street Estate which was administered by the Guinness Trust. The Chairman agreed with these comments and said he felt there was scope to develop these sites, in partnership with the Guiness Trust and third-party stakeholders.

A Member, also the Chair of the Community and Children's Services Committee, emphasised the importance of improved communications with residents to strengthen the relationship with the City Corporation. She had not been present for the motion on housing at the June Court of Common Council meeting, but, having reviewed the meeting, thought that there was some confusion amongst Members on the scope and legal framework of the Housing Revenue Account. She had accordingly arranged an all-Member briefing on this topic to help Members understand the possibilities. She also said that the Community and Children's Services department was focusing on the compliance issue and had a clear action plan. She also drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 22 of the report, which demonstrated that the size and scale of the improvement programme required substantial additional resources in management capacity.

A Member asked if it would be possible to establish a Working Party to develop communications with residents. The Chairman said he would discuss the topic with the Housing Group.

Several Members discussed methods to expedite the Programme, with one Member noting the complexities caused by the Golden Lane Estate's listed status and asking if it was worth considering de-listing the Estate so that the improvements could be progressed more quickly and efficiently. While supportive of this proposal, others said that even working within the listed status a more pragmatic approach was required. The Executive Director of Community and Children's Services said she could explore delisting but warned that it might cause challenges leading to further delays.

A Member noted that paragraph 14 of the report set out the funding sources. While the information presented was factually correct, there were several funding options being explored. This was confirmed by the Executive Director of Community and Children's Services. The Deputy Chairman also requested that officers return with a timeline on initial views of funding following the summer recess. In terms of financial modelling, the Chamberlain said that she would get the first indication on the outcomes of the Fair Funding Review and transitional relief around September. The final local government settlement would be available in November.

Members asked that the terminology in reports clarify that the focus was on social housing, as the City Corporation was involved in housing in several other areas. They asked that officers return with a paper providing a holistic look at the role the City Corporation played in social housing beyond the HRA. and that the required fund was expenditure rather than investment. The Chamberlain confirmed that the programme did not count as an investment as would be handled by the Investment Committee.

The Chairman concluded the discussion by saying that the Programme required a commitment going well into the future.

RESOLVED: That Members:

- Note the identified shortfall in capital and revenue funding
- Note the progress on the Golden Lane investment Programme and the establishment of a Golden Lane Advisory Board to support that work.

8. **FINDING OF MALADMINISTRATION (OMBUDSMAN CASE ID - 24001090) - EMERGENCY SUPPORT SCHEME**

The Committee received a joint report of the Chamberlain and the City Solicitor concerning the delivery of the Emergency Support Scheme.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its contents noted.

9. **RESIDENTIAL RESET UPDATE**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Strategy Officer concerning the City Corporation's residential engagement programme.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its contents noted.

10. **SUPPORT FOR UK-BASED FINANCIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE - INNOVATION AND GROWTH QUARTERLY REPORT**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Innovation and Growth providing an update on the impact of work done to support the UK-based Financial and Professional Services between April 2025 and June 2025.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its contents noted.

11. **REVENUE OUTTURN - 2024/25**

The Committee received a joint report of the Deputy Town Clerk, the Executive Director of Innovation & Growth, the City Remembrancer, the Chief Strategy Officer, the Executive Director of Environment and the Chamberlain concerning the revenue outturn for services overseen by the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its contents noted.

12. **NEW PROJECT PROCEDURE / P3 FRAMEWORK**

The Committee received a report of the Chamberlain concerning the City Corporation's Project Procedure.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its contents noted.

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

Members received a report of the Chamberlain concerning the Committees funds.

RESOLVED: That the report be received and its contents noted.

14. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.

15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
There was no other business.

16. **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.

17. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
a) To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2025
The non-public minutes of the meeting held on 12 June were approved as a correct record.

b) To note the draft non-public minutes of the Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee meeting held on 29 May 2025
The draft non-public minutes of the Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee meeting held on 29 May 2025 were noted.

18. **FINANCIAL SERVICES INVESTMENT HUB/CONCIERGE SERVICE**
The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Innovation & Growth, concerning proposals to establish an Investment Hub.

19. **THE ANNEXE, SMITHFIELD, EC1 – DISPOSAL**
The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor concerning the disposal of a leasehold interest.

20. **BASTION HOUSE STRIP OUT**
The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor concerning Bastion House.

21. **GUILDHALL SCHOOL OF MUSIC & DRAMA CYCLICAL WORKS PROGRAMME 2025 - 2030**
The Committee considered a report of the City Surveyor concerning the progression of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama's Cyclical Works Programme.

22. **GLOBAL RISK SUMMIT 2026**
The Committee received a report of the Executive Director, Innovation & Growth providing information on the City of London Corporation's planned approach to the Global Risk Summit 2026.

23. **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions in the non-public session.

24. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED.**
There was one item of urgent business in the non-public session.

25. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**
a) To agree the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2025
The confidential minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2025 were approved as a correct record in the non-public section.

b) To note the confidential minutes of the Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee meeting held on 29 May 2025
The draft confidential minutes of the Communications and Corporate Affairs Sub-Committee meeting held on 29 May 2025 were noted in the non-public session.

The meeting ended at 3.26 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Ben Dunleavy
ben.dunleavy@cityoflondon.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee(s): Policy & Resources Committee – For decision Court of Common Council – For decision	**Dated:** 18 September 2025 9 October 2025
Subject: Scheme of Delegations – Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation	**Public:** For Decision
This proposal: • **delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes** • **provides statutory duties** • **provides business enabling functions**	**Provides Business Enabling Functions**
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of: Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation	
Report author: Joseph Anstee, Acting CBF Head of Strategy & Governance	

Summary

This report proposes revisions to the Court of Common Council's Officer Scheme of Delegations for the City of London Corporation, specifically to the introductory Overall Delegations to Officers section and the section in respect of the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation (CBF), to support the City Corporation in its ongoing effective administration and governance of CBF, and consistent with the City Corporation's legal obligations as Trustee of the charity. The proposed amendments to the Overall Delegations to Officers and Managing Director of CBF section were considered and endorsed by the CBF Board at its meeting in May 2025. An additional amendment is proposed to the section in respect of the Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer to clarify procedure for writing off debt affecting CBF.

Recommendation(s)

Upon the recommendation of the City Bridge Foundation Board in the discharge of functions for the City Corporation as Trustee of City Bridge Foundation (CBF) in that charity's best interests, the Policy & Resources Committee is recommended in the discharge of its functions to:

i) Agree the proposed amendments to the Overall Delegations to Officers and Managing Director of CBF sections of the Scheme of Delegations for recommendation to the Court of Common Council for approval;
ii) Agree the proposed amendment to the Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer section of the Scheme of Delegations for recommendation to the Court of Common Council for approval; and
iii) Delegate authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and

Deputy Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee, to agree any consequential amendments to the entries in respect of other Chief Officers, where these are required to give effect to the proposed amendments and/or impact on the Managing Director of CBF post.

Main Report

Background

1. The Court of Common Council has agreed the principle that authority should be delegated to Chief Officers (and their nominated Deputies or Assistants) for carrying out the day-to-day management of all City of London Corporation services and for the discharge of specific statutory and non-statutory functions, including those for the City Corporation as trustee of CBF and other charities.

2. This authority from the Court of Common Council is set out in the corporate Scheme of Delegations to Officers, establishing general conditions for the exercise of delegations and also specifying the authority delegated to each of the City Corporation's Chief Officers in the management of their departments and discharging the relevant functions, being accountable to the responsible institutional or service committee and ultimately the Court. Consequently, the Scheme of Delegation sets out the extent to which Chief Officers can take day-to-day management decisions for their department without reference to Members. (This does not prevent further delegations to Chief Officers being made by Members on case-by-case basis, and complements the wider officer delegations set out in the City Corporation's other corporate governance documents, such as Standing Orders, Financial Regulations, and the Procurement and Project Codes. It does not prevent Chief Officers from referring matters within scope of their delegated authority to Members for decision should it be deemed prudent or appropriate in the circumstances.)

3. Being a Chief Officer post, the Managing Director of CBF has an individual entry within the Scheme of Delegations to set out their standing delegated authority for the City Corporation in the discharge of its functions as trustee of CBF without reference to the CBF Board and its Committees. The Managing Director of CBF is also responsible for other functions as the 'Head of Profession for Charities' for the City Corporation, which fall under the ultimate remit of the Policy & Resources Committee, rather than the CBF Board.

4. The CBF Board, acting on behalf of the Court of Common Council as trustee of CBF, should be assured that CBF's decision-making processes are informed, rigorous and timely; and that effective delegation, control and risk assessment, and management systems are set up and monitored. The Charity Governance Code's recommended practice for larger charities is that the Board regularly reviews which matters are reserved to the Board and which can be delegated, and collectively exercises the powers of delegation to senior managers, committees or individual trustees, staff or volunteers. Any delegation framework should also be described in a document which provides sufficient detail on scope, and clear limitations on the exercise of the delegated authority, so that the delegations can be clearly understood and carried out, with systems in place to record, monitor and oversee how delegations are exercised and decision-makers held to account.

5. The City Corporation's Policy & Resources Committee is the body responsible for the review and co-ordination of the governance of the City of London Corporation.

Current Position

6. The Managing Director of CBF's entry was added to the Scheme of Delegations following the establishment of the then-BHE Board during 2021, and the implementation of operational changes associated with a new organisational Target Operating Model for the City Corporation in December 2020, and has not been substantively reviewed since it was initially drafted. In reporting to the Court at the time the Board was established, and previously in reporting on the new Target Operating Model for the City Corporation, it was recognised that there would be a need to update the corporate governance framework, including the Officer Scheme of Delegations, to properly reflect those agreed changes.

7. The scope of the delegations to Chief Officers set out in the Scheme of Delegations in discharging the City Corporation's functions as Trustee of CBF do not disturb the functions vested by Royal Charter, statute, common law, and custom and practice, in the ancient Offices of the City Corporation, which include the Town Clerk, Chamberlain, Comptroller & City Solicitor and City Remembrancer. Otherwise, in administering CBF, the City Corporation may in setting its delegation framework to officers, determine how that may be agreed in the charity's best interests.

8. In consolidating oversight of the charity's activities under one Member committee, it was recognised that the City Corporation as Trustee would also better meet its obligations to administer the charity effectively to further CBF's charitable purposes in the charity's best interests, by drawing together strategic and operational oversight of CBF's activities under one Chief Officer, accountable to the responsible Member committee. Thus, the Managing Director of CBF post has been given explicit strategic oversight of the charity's operation and activities, alongside direct responsibility for specific CBF functions. Currently, some direct responsibilities for operational CBF activities, such as engineering and investment property, remain with other Chief Officers working collegiately with the CBF Managing Director in his strategic oversight role, overseen by the CBF Board.

9. As part of an internal Governance Review of CBF, it was agreed that the corporate Scheme of Delegations entry for the Managing Director of CBF post would therefore be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure that the standing written delegations are:

   (a) Appropriately organised to best support the effective exercise of standing delegated authority to officers in the day-to-day management of the charity in its best interests;

   (b) Consistent with the constitutional and governance principles agreed by the Court of Common Council for the good administration and management of the charity;

   (c) Accurately reflect the decisions taken in adopting the agreed Target Operating Model and relevant departmental restructures

   (d) Sufficiently mindful of the need to manage conflicts of interest/loyalty in discharging the City Corporation's functions across the whole in accordance with the Conflicts of Interests Policy agreed by the Court of Common Council for CBF; and

   (e) Accounting for any changes in operation and management since the entry in the Scheme of Delegations was last formally updated.

Proposal(s)

Managing Director of CBF

10. Following review of the Scheme of Delegations, proposed revisions to the introductory Overall Delegations to Officers section and the Managing Director of CBF entry are set out in **Appendix 1** to this report.

11. The proposed revisions are not intended to add new functions to the Managing Director of CBF's remit or make fundamental changes to the post, but to clarify the functions already attributed to the post and the process by which these should be discharged to support the charity's effective administration consistent with the City Corporation's duties as charity trustee, as well as to capture other ongoing standing delegations agreed separately by the CBF Board.

12. The proposed revisions are considered to support the objectives agreed by the Court as set out in paragraph 8 above. They will further the implementation of the principles agreed for the good administration and management of the charity in having CBF's fundamental strategic oversight being led by, and substantive day to-day operation of the charity's activities being within the remit of, one department with the Managing Director of CBF, being accountable for the trustee under the oversight of the CBF Board. This is aligned to the delegation and management arrangements in place for the City Corporation's other institutions, as reported in the Court in agreeing the new Target Operating Model for the institutions, including CBF.

13. Members of the Court, and of the CBF Board, have indicated their support for increased delegation to officers to support more effective and expedient decision-making. For CBF these considerations are particularly acute with the multiple concurrent workstreams underway for CBF and for the City Corporation more generally, and as CBF activities are split across departments. Thus, it is increasingly important the Managing Director of CBF, having regard to the strategic responsibilities of his post, has proper visibility of and appropriate input into strategic decisions and decisions with significant financial implications for CBF, particularly where these involve work across City Corporation departments. As such, bringing greater clarity to the standing delegation framework and having robust procedures for progressing officer approvals under delegated authority, will help ensure that all relevant factors across the whole of the charity's operations are properly considered in taking decisions in the charity's best interests.

Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer

14. Additionally, an amendment is sought within the entry for the Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer to ensure that procedure for the approval of debt write-offs for CBF provides for consultation with the CBF & Charities Finance Director. This amendment would rectify a discrepancy between the wording of the Scheme of Delegations and Financial Regulations, which state that write-offs relating to City Bridge Foundation should also be reported to the CBF Finance Director. The wording of the Financial Regulations will then be considered to ensure the wording is consistent at the point they are next reviewed. The Chamberlain was consulted on the proposal and is supportive of the proposed amendment.

Further Review

15. In agreeing the constitution of the then-BHE Board in 2021, the Court of Common Council authorised the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Comptroller & City Solicitor, to make any consequential changes to the City Corporation's corporate governance documents which were required to support the effective implementation of the new Board.

16. With reference to this delegation, amendments to the Scheme of Delegations entry for the Managing Director of CBF may necessitate consequential amendments to the delegations of other Chief Officers that discharge some CBF functions, such as the City Surveyor in respect of CBF property, or the Executive Director of Environment in respect of the engineering functions for the Thames bridges.

17. In support of the above, delegated authority is sought for the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee, to agree, following further review in conjunction with other City Corporation departments, any consequential amendments to the Scheme of Delegation sections in respect of other Chief Officers, where these are required to give effect to the proposed amendments and/or impact on the Managing Director of CBF post.

Implications

18. Strategic implications – The proposals are considered to further the outcomes of the Strategic Governance Review of BHE by ensuring that - the charity's decision-making processes are sufficiently independent, conflicts of interest are managed appropriately, the Managing Director of CBF is duly consulted on decisions involving the charity, the delegation framework is clearly understood, and decision-makers are accountable. They will also support the progression of the charity's overarching *Bridging London 2020-2045* strategy by enabling strategic workstreams and in applying agreed charity strategies and policies.

19. Legal implications – The Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department have been appropriately engaged in respect of revisions both to the Managing Director of CBF's section and to the Scheme of Delegations more generally to ensure that any amendments recommended to the Court of Common Council are consistent with the City Corporation's legal responsibilities and any legal or governance restrictions in making delegations to officers.

Conclusion

20. A review and revision of the corporate Scheme of Delegations to Officers in respect of the Managing Director of CBF post has been identified as being in the best interests of the charity in its good administration and management. The proposals are considered to progress the implementation of the Court of Common Council's previous strategic decisions in respect of CBF and general governance decisions taken for the City Corporation, and will support implementation of optimal governance and management arrangements for the charity, consistent with the City Corporation's core trustee duties.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Draft Revised Scheme of Delegations: Overall Delegations to Officers & Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation
- Appendix 2 – Draft Revised Scheme of Delegations: Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer

Background Papers

City Bridge Foundation Board, May 2025: Item 22 - Scheme of Delegations

Joseph Anstee
Acting CBF Head of Strategy & Governance
E: joseph.anstee@citybridgefoundation.org.uk

Scheme of Delegations to Officers

The General Conditions of Delegations

Overall Delegations to Officers

The Court of Common Council has agreed the principle that authority should be delegated to Chief Officers (and their nominated Deputies or Assistants) for carrying out the day-to-day management of all services and for the discharge of specific statutory and non-statutory functions, including those for the City Corporation as charity trustee.

All delegations to officers are subject to any statutory or other legal provisions which apply; the exclusion of any matters which remain for decision by the Court and/or any Committee unless specifically delegated to a particular officer; and accountability to the Court and/or any Committee in respect of decisions made under delegated authority.

All delegations to officers in accordance with the general powers detailed below are to be exercised on a case-by-case basis in consultation with ~~the~~ other relevant Chief Officers where appropriate and shall be deemed to be exercisable in relation to the City of London Corporation in any of its legal capacities unless otherwise specified or the context indicates otherwise.

Several senior officers are also considered Head of Profession for an Enabling Function. These officers are responsible for the management and delivery of enabling services across the City Corporation such as legal, finance, corporate communications, and HR. A Head of Profession must ensure ~~a high-quality service is delivered across the organisation through~~ the standardisation and development of their enabling service to support ~~a~~ high-quality services being delivered across the organisation.

Day-to-Day Management

Chief Officers (and their nominated Deputies or Assistants) are authorised to implement agreed policies and to act on the City of London Corporation's behalf in the discharge of its statutory and non-statutory functions and to exercise powers in relation to the day-to-day management of the service area for which they are responsible. (Day-to-day management should include those items which have been recognised as such by past practice or by specific decision/resolution, or where the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chief Officers, agrees is ancillary to or analogous with matters accepted as being within the scope of day-to-day business exercisable by officers.) This includes authority to:

a. appoint and manage staff in accordance with agreed policies and procedures, except to where this scheme of delegation indicates otherwise;

b. undertake staff re-organisation in accordance with agreed policies and procedures and within budget limitations;

c. place orders and enter into contracts for the supply of goods and services in line with the ~~the~~ City of London Corporation's Procurement Code, Parts 1 and 2 and to authorise or incur any other expenditure for which provision has been made in the appropriate budget or capital programme subject to limits set out in Standing Orders and Financial Regulations and subject to these not being in conflict with existing contracts:

- Procurement Code - Part 1 – can be made available on request.
- Procurement Code - Part 2 - can be made available on request.

d. Manage any physical assets, including land and buildings for which the relevant Chief Officer is accountable until formally declared surplus under Standing Orders, subject always to consultation with and the approval of the City Surveyor and Executive Director Property as Head of Profession for Estates and Facilities Management and in accordance with any relevant policies and strategies in relation to property asset management.

Limitations

1. Any exercise of delegated powers by officers shall:

   a. comply with all the ~~City of London Corporation's~~ governing or constitutional documents as relevant to the function being discharged.

   b. comply with the City Corporation's own corporate governance framework set by or with the authority of the Court of Common Council (such as Standing Orders, the White Paper and Committee Terms of Reference, Financial Regulations, Procurement Code, Project Procedure, etc);

   c. have regard to any agreed policies, objectives, strategies and service standards including any management directions;

   d. have regard to the overall management and co-ordination of the work of the City Corporation and the achievement of corporate standards, as relevant;

   e. ~~not~~ authorise expenditure only ~~except~~ in accordance with approved budgets, revenue estimates or capital programmes, as relevant;

   f. not involve a new policy or extend an existing policy which has been adopted by the City Corporation (except where the Town Clerk and Chief Executive is acting in accordance with urgency powers);

   g. be in accordance with any existing approved scheme or direction of the City Corporation, its Courts, Committees or Sub-Committees; and

   h. be the subject of prior consultations with the appropriate Head of Profession or technical officers of the City Corporation where technical and/or professional considerations are concerned which are not within the province of, or which are shared with the Chief Officer.

i. in respect of delegated powers exercised as charity trustee, be in the best interests of the relevant charity and in accordance with the relevant charity's own governing document.

2. Any delegation to a Chief Officer may be exercised by any officer authorised by the Chief Officer either generally or specifically for the purpose (except where restrictions exist in employment policies). The Town Clerk may exercise any function delegated to a Chief Officer at his discretion.

3. All delegation is without prejudice to the jurisdiction of the City of London Corporation its Courts, Committees or Sub-Committees. Any officer may refer a matter to a Committee or Sub-Committee in lieu of exercising delegated powers.

4. Subject to the foregoing conditions and to any special conditions which may have been or may in future be applied in respect of particular matters Chief Officers will be expected to make such decisions and to initiate such action as they deem necessary in the interests of the efficient running of their departments and the functions they discharge

5. Within their terms of delegation any reference to a statutory provision shall be deemed to refer to any statutory re-enactment or amendment of the provision.

The following powers are delegated to Chief Officers:

Expenditure

6. To incur revenue and capital expenditure and enter into commitments on behalf of the City of London Corporation where appropriate provision has been included in either the revenue or capital estimates, subject to compliance with Standing Orders, Financial Regulations, the Project Procedure and Procurement Code.

7. To authorise virement of local risk budgets in accordance with Financial Regulations, subject to the approval of the Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer.

8. To authorise projects with a total budget of up to a threshold as set out within the City of London Corporation's Projects Procedure.

Contracts

9. To approve contracts that are exempt from the Procurement Code, as referenced in the Corporate Competitive Procurement Exemption Policy (made available on request) which outlines the exemption relationship, subject to:

   a. A £1,000,000 upper threshold;
   b. A reporting procedure being put into place;
   c. Officers maintaining adequate documentation, recording the detailed checks undertaken to support the approval of the contractual situation;

d. Officers being required to declare any conflict of interest in procurement that they have no personal connection with the contractors.

10. To sign contracts, in accordance with established procedures, where the signature of the Comptroller and City Solicitor is not required.

Property

11. Subject to the prior consultation with and approval of the City Surveyor and Executive Director Property and adherence to corporate processes for Asset Management and relevant Standing Orders, and for property management services (Facilities Management, Estates Management etc.) to deal with the day-to-day management of all property and facilities under their control where specific functions have not been delegated to another officer.

Surplus Equipment

12. To dispose of surplus or obsolete vehicles, plant, apparatus, furniture, office or other books and equipment subject to any requirements laid down by the Head of Profession for Commercial Services. If the item is technology equipment, then this needs to be disposed of in line with any requirements laid down by the Head of Profession for Digital and IT.

Casual Lettings

13. Subject to the prior consultation with the City Surveyor and Executive Director Property, to approve the casual or occasional use of land, premises or equipment under the control of the responsible and/or occupying department.

Access to Information

14. To act as proper officer for the purpose of identifying background papers for reports written by the department. In the case of joint reports this role will be discharged by the Senior Officer responsible for the service.

Health and Safety

15. To be responsible for ensuring, so far as is reasonably practicable ~~practical~~, the health, ~~and~~ safety and welfare of employees and members of the public ~~everyone~~ who may be affected by the work and activities of the department. Members of the Court of Common Council and the Court of Aldermen, contractors, volunteers and casual workers are all considered to be members of the public for the purposes of this requirement.

16. To comply with the City Corporation's Health and Safety Policy and standards, delegating this responsibility as appropriate in accordance with the Policy.

Heads of Profession

17. In discharging their responsibilities as set out under the Limitations at 1c.~~b)~~ and 1h.~~g)~~ above, to recognise the Head of Profession as the professional lead for

'enabling functions' (cross-cutting services that support departments in the delivery of front-line services and functions). The current list of Heads of Profession can be made available on request**.**

18. To consult with and support the Head of Profession in their duty to develop and maintain functional and professional standards and oversee their application through local or central resources.

19. To consult with the Head of Profession on the specific demands the department has for enabling functions, and to support the determination of appropriate delivery model(s) (either via central, shared or local resources) that will meet these needs, whilst also recognising the need to deliver high quality services, value for money and resilience for the City Corporation overall. To routinely review and revise these needs and delivery models with the Head of Profession to support continuous improvement.

20. To support the Head of Profession in the development and management of professional network(s) that draw together individuals from across the City Corporation to provide support, training and further development opportunities.

21. To consult with the Head of Profession where there are risks associated with a particular function, and to support them in the development of suitable mitigations; and where this is not effective, to proactively escalate risks to the Town Clerk and Chief Executive.

***NB:** For ease of reference, approval of the amendment to City Bridge Foundation of references to Bridge House Estates is assumed, the Town Clerk already having authority to make such amendments.*

MANAGING DIRECTOR OF CITY BRIDGE FOUNDATION

The Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation has the following delegated authority:

Bridge House Estates (operating under the working name of City Bridge Foundation) (Charity Reg. No. 1035628)

For the City Corporation in the discharge of its functions as charity trustee of City Bridge Foundation:

General

1. To be the officer with overall strategic oversight of, and to have ultimate responsibility for, the effective and efficient administration and management of City Bridge Foundation operating as an institution within the City Corporation's corporate governance framework, in consultation with any other relevant Chief Officer having delegated authority for the discharge of specific City Bridge Foundation functions.

2. To be the officer directly responsible for the day-to-day management and administration of City Bridge Foundation other than where functions are expressly delegated to another Chief Officer~~.~~ in which case they will consult with the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation.

3. In discharging the functions as provided under paragraphs 1 and 2, to be the officer responsible for overseeing the good governance and financial management of City Bridge Foundation, including investment management (of any asset type) in consultation with the Chamberlain and/or City Surveyor (or authorised delegate) to ensure that the charity's governance is fit for purpose and its finances and assets are efficiently and effectively managed in administering the charity and furthering its purposes.

4. Where authorised (whether under this Scheme of Delegations or otherwise), to sign agreements or other documents on behalf of City Bridge Foundation except where - the signature of the Comptroller and City Solicitor is required, the City Corporation's seal is required to be affixed, or another Chief Officer is authorised to act under their delegated authority in the discharge of the relevant functions.

5. To authorise expenditure from City Bridge Foundation's central contingency budget of up to £500,000.

6. In the exercise of delegated authority, including as stated under this Scheme of Delegations, to always:

   a. act in City Bridge Foundation's best interests;

b. act in accordance with any strategies, policies and procedures which have been adopted for the charity, and
c. be accountable to the City Bridge Foundation Board, and any sub-committees it may establish in accordance with their terms of reference, and ultimately to the Court of Common Council.

Specific
Further to paragraph 2 above:

Operational – Bridges and Operational Property

7. To be responsible for ensuring, in consultation with any other Chief Officer in the exercise of their delegated authority, that all functions relating to the charity's primary purpose, the support and maintenance of the charity's five Bridges including highways and approaches privately maintainable by the charity, are properly discharged in the charity's best interests.

8. To take all management decisions affecting charity bridge, operational property and assets, including: intellectual property rights, use of and access to charity records and archives, use and letting of bridge property or other operational charity property within the financial limits delegated to officers taking relevant advice from other City Corporation professional officers.

9. To be responsible for the charity's tourism and educational activities undertaken at Tower Bridge and its surrounds in accordance with policies set, including to:

    a. revise all fees and charges, including admission fees for Tower Bridge, with the discretion to reduce or waive such fees and charges in appropriate circumstances for Tower Bridge;
    b. agree all hire charges;
    c. negotiate and agree non-fee-based benefits for Tower Bridge in respect of filming and other production activity on or affecting the Bridge;
    d. to negotiate and agree costs of sales and discounts in relation to the retail businesses being conducted at Tower Bridge.

10. To exercise powers under Section 29 of the Corporation of London Tower Bridge Act 1885 and Section 11 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1971 for the opening of Tower Bridge for the navigation of vessels on the River Thames.

11. To liaise with Historic England or any other Governmental body pursuant to the provisions of any existing agreement made between the City of Corporation and Historic England or any other Governmental body relating to matters affecting Tower Bridge and its approaches.

Operational – Charitable Funding Activities

12. To be responsible for the day-to-day management and administration of the charity's funding activities in furthering the charity's ancillary purpose (including social investment), including to develop a policy for that purpose and, in doing so, to consult such persons, etc. as is deemed appropriate; and, to notify the Charity Commission of the consultation process from time to time in writing.

13. To approve or reject funding applications and social investment proposals up to the threshold agreed at which decisions should be reserved to the City Bridge Foundation Board (or, where delegated by the Board to a sub-committee).

Philanthropy & Charitable Activities - Head of Profession

14. To act as Head of Profession for the City Corporation's philanthropic and charitable activities, including grant-giving (both charitable and non-charitable) and to –

    a. provide strategic advice and guidance on philanthropy, and charitable good governance and good practice;
    b. be responsible for the Central ~~Grants Unit~~ Funding and Charities Management Team (except the financial officers discharging the delegated authority of the Chamberlain) and oversight of the Central Grants Programme, working with the Charities Finance Team which operates under the oversight of the Charities Finance Director under Chamberlain's delegated authority;
    c. be responsible for oversight of the implementation of the City Corporation's Benefits in Kind Policy;

Delegation to other Officers

15. The following authority is also delegated to the officers indicated to be exercised either:
    a. At the discretion of the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation or
    b. In the absence of the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation

- City Bridge Foundation Chief Operating Officer/Operations Director – Items 3, 4, ~~and~~ 6, 7, 8
- Director of Tower Bridge – Items 7 to 11
- Chief Funding Director – Items 12 and 13

CHAMBERLAIN AND CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

The following powers are delegated to the Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer:

Operational

1. To be the officer responsible for the conduct of the City of London Corporation's financial affairs and, in particular, to be the proper officer for the purpose of Section 6 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

2. In consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee to authorise the carry forward of unspent balances within the revenue budgets.

3. To authorise all virements within locally controlled budgets.

4. To exercise such powers as may from time to time be delegated to them through the Treasury Policy Statement.

5. To authorise the payment of precepts, levies and contributions to the national non-domestic rates pool.

6. To operate market force supplements for Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer's Department staff within the set maximums.

7. To determine the financing of capital expenditure.

8. To deal with and agree claims received under the Riot (Damages) Act, 1886.

9. Approval of the Council Tax Base.

10. The write off debts due to the City of London Corporation which are irrecoverable for the following areas is delegated as follows:-

    i) National Non-Domestic Rates/Business Improvement Districts/City Premium - up to £100,000 (Head of Financial Shared Services) and of up to £500,000 (Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer), with any amount in excess of £500,000 to be submitted to Finance Committee for approval.
    ii) Investment Property Debt – up to £100,000 (Head of Financial Shared Services) and up to £500,000 (Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer) with any amount in excess of £500,000 to be submitted to Finance Committee or Bridge House Estates Board for approval as relevant and Property Investment Board for information (where relevant).
    iii) All other debt types - up to £50,000 (Head of Financial Shared Services) and of up to £100,000 (Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer), with any amount in excess of £100,000 to be submitted to Finance Committee or Bridge House Estates Board for approval as relevant and to the relevant service committee for information (where relevant).
    iv) All Small Balance write offs of any amount under £1000 (Head of Service).

v) All write-offs affecting City Bridge Foundation should be progressed in consultation with the CBF & Charities Finance Director.

11. To write off all unclaimed credit amounts (Head of Financial Shared Services).

12. To authorise the granting of discretionary rate relief under section 47 and section 49 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 in line with the relevant government guidance or any schemes agreed by Court of Common Council, (Head of Financial Shared Services or Head of Business Rates).

13. To agree (Local Government Finance Act 1988) Section 44A Allowances (empty rate relief on partly occupied properties). (Head of Financial Shared Services or Head Business Rates).

14. To agree minor amendments to the ordinance of City Companies and Livery Companies in consultation with the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen.

15. To act as Head of Profession for Finance, with the right to issue technical standards and guidance in respect of such matters for use throughout the City of London Corporation and to be consulted on staffing arrangements for any of those functions within other Departments.

16. To carry out all functions in relation to Trophy Tax.

17. To sign grant claims, investment documentation and other returns on behalf of the City of London Corporation.

18. To authorise the suspension of pension contributions.

Delegations to other Officers

19. In addition to the Officers identified above, the following authorities are also delegated to other Officers identified to be exercised either:

    a. at the direction of the Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer; or,
    b. in the absence of the Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer

- Financial Services Director - Items 5, 9-12, and 14

- Deputy Director, Financial Services }
  Items 5, 15 and 16
- Corporate Treasurer }

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee(s): Investment Committee – For decision Finance Committee – For decision Policy & Resources Committee – For Decision	**Dated:** 21 July 2025 9 September 2025 18 September 2025
Subject: Investment governance update	**Public report:** For Decision
This proposal: • **delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes**	All outcomes - the City Corporation's investment portfolio provides the financing behind delivery of the Corporate Plan outcomes
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	n/a
What is the source of Funding?	n/a
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	n/a
Report of:	City Surveyors (CS 170/25) Town Clerk
Report author:	Robert Murphy Ben Dunleavy

Summary

The Court of Common Council approved increases to the thresholds for investment property transactions as set out in Standing Orders at its meeting in May 2025, on the recommendation of the Policy & Resources Committee following consideration by the Investment and Finance Committees. One effect of changes was to raise the threshold under which transactions could be approved under officer delegation to £20 million. As part of the approval process, officers undertook to return to Members with further information on the internal procedure that will be applied for taking those delegated decisions. This report explains the procedure and also seeks approval for an additional amendment to the Standing Orders to include leasehold restructurings.

Recommendation(s)

Members are asked to note the procedure for approving investment property transactions as set out at paragraph 5 and 2.

Members of the Investment and Finance Committees are asked to endorse the following to the Policy and Resources Committee, for onward recommendation to the Court of Common Council:

- Amend the thresholds for investment property transactions in Standing Orders as set out at paragraphs 3 to 5 and in Appendix 1.
- Authorise the Town Clerk to make the necessary amendment to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers to give effect to these changed thresholds.

Main Report

Property transaction thresholds

Delegated Authority Procedure

Background

1. The thresholds for property transactions (both investment and operational) are contained at Part 9 of the Standing Orders. In 2024, Members at various meetings directed officers to review these thresholds as they had stood for some time. Members of the Resource Allocation Sub Committee, at their informal annual away day in 2024, also noted that the current arrangements hindered the dynamic management of the investment property portfolio, especially at a time when funds were required to support the City Corporation's capital commitments.

2. At their February 2025 meetings, the Investment and Finance Committees and the City Bridge Foundation Board were presented with proposed revisions to the Standing Orders, as part of wider reports on investment governance and the City Bridge Foundation Board's governance arrangements respectively. They endorsed the recommendations to increase the thresholds so that all transactions below £20million would be approved under delegation to officers. Transactions of £20million to less than £50million would require approval from the relevant Committees, while any transactions of £50million and over would require further approval from the Court of Common Council. This was subsequently recommended by the Policy & Resources Committee to the Court of Common Council and approved in May 2025.

3. Members supported the changes as it was felt they would allow for more dynamic management of the investment portfolios; the increased authorisation to officers would allow for decisions on property transactions to be made in a more agile manner, while still allowing Members to retain oversight of the strategic direction of the investment portfolio.

4. Members also noted that delegation procedure controls would be reviewed and updated proportionally, and that officers would return with an update on these.

Current Position

5. The City Surveyor has reviewed the delegation procedure controls for City's Estate and City Fund, to be applied as follows:

    a. The Annual Plan for both City Fund and City Estate to include the planned property interests for disposal.
    b. If an acquisition or a disposal which has not been included in the Annual Plan is brought forward, approval to the principle of the transaction is to be agreed by the City Surveyor and Chamberlain.
    c. The terms of transactions of up to a value of £10 million value is subject to the approval of the Director Investment Property Group.
    d. The terms of transactions of between £10 million and £20 million value is subject to the approval of the City Surveyor.
    e. All transactions will be subject to verification by the Valuation Panel.

f. The Terms of Reference for the Valuation Panel for investment property transactions will be extended to include approval of the rationale, terms and value of the transaction.
g. All proposed transactions will be subject to a report similar to a Committee Report which will be circulated for consultation across all the relevant departments specifically including the Chamberlain, City Surveyor, Comptroller and City Solicitor, Town Clerk.
h. Town Clerk and City Surveyor will establish a system for auditing and recording all transactions within this procedure.
i. Investment and Finance Committees will be notified of all transaction under delegated authorities in accordance with the current practice of updating on actions taken under delegation.

Proposed update to approved increases to the thresholds for investment property transactions

6. The thresholds for property transactions (both investment and operational) are contained at Part 9 of the Standing Orders (SO 54, 56 and 57.)

7. This report refers only to the investment property assets for City Fund and City's Estate as defined at SO 54.1 and does not include operational property assets or those managed for City Bridge Foundation.

8. Leasehold Restructurings, set out in SO 57, currently require that the grant of any lease at less than full rack rent of 175 years or less is subject to the approval of the Investment Committee. The recommendation is to add grants of leases of at less than full rack rent of less than 175 years with premiums to be subject to the same delegation to officers.

9. For clarity, the changes to the Standing Order is included in the relevant appendices.

10. The approved increases to the thresholds for investment property transactions changes Standing Orders, so that all transactions below £20m would be approved under delegation to officers, with transactions of £50m and over requiring approval from the Court of Common Council. All transactions between these two limits would require approval from both the Investment and Finance Committees. The City Surveyor Scheme of Delegations is to be amended to incorporate the amended delegation in respect of City Fund and City's Estate property acquisitions and disposals.

11. Members were also asked to consider if, in the long-term, the thresholds for property transactions should be separated out from the Standing Orders into a set of guidelines, similar to the Procurement Code, with authority to amend this delegated by the Court to the Investment, Finance and Policy and Resources Committees; however, no opinion was given on this.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

Strategic implications

12. The changes will support the delivery of the Corporate Plan 2024-2029 through improving the governance around the City Corporation's investments which help provide funding for the services in the Corporate Plan and in supporting the Investment Strategy.

Financial implications

13. The changes would not require any additional spending.

Resource implications

14. The recommendations will not require any additional resource. Raising the Standing Order thresholds would also reduce the number of transaction reports written by officers for Committee approval.

Legal implications

15. The Comptroller and City Solicitor's department has been consulted, and their comments incorporated in the report.

Equalities implications

16. The proposals in the report will not have any impact (positive or negative) on people protected by existing equality legislation.

Climate implications

17. There are no climate implications.

Security implications

18. There are no security implications.

Conclusion

19. The recommended revisions to the above aspects of the governance of the City Corporation's investment assets will allow for more agile and dynamic decision-making at a time when the City Corporation is required to draw on its investment portfolio to support a range of activities, including its capital programme.

Appendices

Deletions are in the appendices are marked by being struck through; additions are underlined

- Appendix 1 – Revisions to Standing Orders

Standing Order 57 - Leasehold Disposals/Surrenders

City Fund & City's Estate

All lettings shall be subject to the following: -

(a) lettings for a period of 30 years or less, including lease renewals and the grant of easements, wayleaves and similar arrangements as well as all rent reviews, shall be solely subject to the approval of the Committee having control of such property or any properly authorised Officer (under the scheme of delegations): -

(b) for City Fund and City's Estate the grant of any lease at less than full rack rental value for a period of 175 years or more (including optional extensions of term) shall require the approval of the Investment Committee (investment property assets), The grant of any lease at less than full rack rental value for a period of 175 years or less (including optional extensions of term) shall be delegated to officers. Any premium being subject to the following approvals: -

Anticipated Receipt	Approval by
Less than £20,000,000 ~~£2,500,000~~	Officer Delegation
£20,000,000 to less than £50,000,000 ~~£2,500,000 to less than £5,000,000~~	Investment Committee and Finance Committee
£50,000,000 and above	Investment Committee, Finance Committee and Court of Common Council

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee(s) Policy & Resources – For Decision	Dated: 18th September 2025
Subject: Appointment of Additional Internal Members to Competitiveness Advisory Board	**Public**
This proposal: • Delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes	Dynamic Economic Growth
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	**No**
If so, how much?	**N/A**
What is the source of Funding?	**N/A**
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	**N/A**
Report of: Damian Nussbaum, Executive Director of Innovation & Growth	**For Decision**
Report author: Daniel O'Byrne, Strategic Engagement and Operations Director Benjamin Dixon, Head of Policy, Office of the Policy Chairman	

Summary

This report seeks agreement to update the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Competitiveness Advisory Board (CAB) for its next term (2025–2028/29), specifically in relation to the appointment of internal Members.

It notes that the current TOR do not provide a mechanism to make a recommendation in the event that candidates are tied after officer scoring.

It proposes that the Chairman, in consultation with the ex officio members of CAB, be granted discretion to determine the number of internal Members appointed from the Court of Common Council, based on the scoring and recommendations of an officer panel. This approach ensures flexibility in aligning appointments with the Board's strategic needs and the quality of Expressions of Interest received.

The report also recommends the endorsement of five new Members for appointment and confirms that no other changes are proposed to the CAB's composition or recruitment process.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Agree that the Terms of Reference for the Competitiveness Advisory Board be updated to include the ability for the Chairman, in consultation with the ex officio members, to exercise discretion over the number of internal Members appointed from the Court of Common Council, based on the scoring and recommendations provided by the officer panel.

Subject to the decision above, Members are also asked to:

- Endorse the appointment of the following individuals to the CAB for the 2025–2028/29 term:
    - Melissa Collett
    - Prem Goyal
    - Stephen Hodgson
    - Shravan Joshi
    - Sushil Saluja

MAIN REPORT

Background

1. On 18th February 2021 the Policy and Resources adopted the recommendations of the Fraser 2.0 report including the creation of the CAB.
2. The role of the Advisory Board is:
    a. To provide informal guidance or direction to Innovation & Growth and other officers on the implementation of the Competitiveness Strategy (whilst being clear that formal oversight would be held by Policy & Resources, with this group reporting in on an advisory basis).
    b. To provide expertise and insight to officers and Policy & Resources on the ingredients of global success of UK Financial and Professional Services, acting as an internal forum for the testing of ideas and prioritisation in the work of promotion and policy of the sector.
    c. To offer additional support to the Chair of Policy and Resources and the Lord Mayor as champions of UK financial and professional services (UK FPS).
    d. To provide advice on the strategic deployment of hospitality as required.
3. The composition of the Steering Committee as previously agreed by Policy and Resources was as follows:
    a. Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee (Chair)
    b. Chair of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen (Deputy Chair)
    c. Deputy Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee
    d. Deputy Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen
    e. Four Members of the Court of Common Council with relevant expertise
    f. Four co-opted external members with relevant expertise.
4. In December 2023 this Committee agreed the CAB Membership would be updated to comprise:
    - 8 Members of the Court of Common Council (previously 4)

- 4 ex-officio Members (Chair and Deputy Chair of P&R, Chair and Deputy Chair of GP Aldermen), and
- 12 external members drawn from the private sector (previously 8).

5. The CAB has become a very successful mechanism to inform the onward development of the Competitiveness Strategy. It provides the Chairman and this Committee one, but not the only, perspective in developing policy and strategies on how to strengthen and promote the UK's financial and professional services sector.
6. The appointments are renewed yearly. Members could serve up to 3-4 years at the pleasure of the Chair. External members were asked to make at least two-year commitments.
7. Criteria for membership of the non ex-officio members of the Board was previously agreed by Policy and Resources in February 2021 as follows:

a. The Board would best benefit from broad and deep expertise across a number of markets and sub-sectors relevant to UK financial and professional services sector (FPS). Preference will be given to those with senior level experience and expertise on 2 or more sectors and/or markets.

b. Expertise and experience should be based on direct market participation.

c. Composition of the Board should balance diversity of perspective, thought, expertise and experience.

d. The Board will also benefit from members who: 1. have experience and expertise within new and emerging sub-sectors and themes of FPS and 2. in managing FPS businesses located in London with headquarters in foreign jurisdictions.

8. There is a high value in constituting a Board with a diversity of perspectives and expertise and was used for the criteria of selection.

Priority Markets	Sectors	Perspectives
US	Banking	Sustainability
Europe	Asset Management	New FPS/Tech
China	Professional Services	Regulatory
India	Legal	Global Customer
Japan	Insurance	Cross UK
	Market Infrastructure	

9. The Board has consistently met quarterly since July 2021.
10. The lead members are not all regular Members of the Board. They are invited guests of the Chairman on relevant topics.
11. The Lord Mayor while not a Member of the Board has also attended at the pleasure of the Chair when in London.

Current Position

12. Current Ex Officio Members are:
    a. Chris Hayward, as Chair of Policy and Resources (P&R), *Chair of CAB*
    b. Sir William Russell, as Chair of General Purposes Committee (GPC), *Deputy Chair of CAB*
    c. James Thomson as Deputy Chair P&R
    d. Sir Charles Bowman as Deputy of GPC
13. Current regular Members are:
    a. Vincent Keaveny
    b. Hugh Selka
    c. Antony Manchester
    d. Simon Pryke
14. A call for new Expressions of Interest was sent on 17th June 2025.
15. Five (5) expressions of Interest were received by the deadline of 27th June 2025.
16. An officer panel has carried out an initial assessment of the Expressions of Interest against the criteria identified in the December 2023 Policy and Resources paper. These criteria were an exact match to the original criteria when the CAB was set up in July of 2021.
17. The officer panel consisted of:
    a. Benjamin Dixon, Head of the Policy Unit, Office of the Policy Chairman
    b. Daniel O'Byrne, Strategic Engagement and Operations Director, Innovation and Growth
    c. Ana Nishnianidze, Trade and Investment Director, Innovation and Growth
    d. Kristy Sandino, Director of Strategic Communications and External Affairs
18. Candidates were scored on a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 indicating the strongest alignment to the criteria. And candidates scoring 3 are not considered an ideal match to the criteria for Board membership. The current terms of reference do not include guidance on how to proceed when multiple applicants receive the same score.
19. A full scoring sheet was presented to the Chair and Deputy Chair for review and has resulted in the recommendations in paragraphs 22-24.
20. Members should note that the quality of the applications was high. None of the applications we adjudged to have scored 3. Therefore all five candidates demonstrated strong credentials with a number being tied on the same score.
21. Given the strength of the applications, Officers have made the recommendation that the CAB TOR be amended to allow for the Chairman to exercise discretion in such circumstances to seek approval for an additional appointment to the Board.

Recommendations

22. Agree that the Chairman of the CAB, in consultation with the ex officio members, may exercise discretion over the number of internal Members appointed from the Court of Common Council, based on the scoring and recommendations provided by the officer panel.

23. Subject to the decision in relation to paragraph 22, endorse the appointment of the following individuals to the CAB for the 2025–2028/29 term:

    a. Melissa Collett

    b. Prem Goyal

    c. Stephen Hodgson

    d. Shravan Joshi

    e. Sushil Saluja

24. It is proposed that no other changes to the terms are made for the 2025-2028/29 including the method of recruitment of internal and external Members.

Options

25. Members can agree to the recommended approach above.

26. Members can ask Officers to suggest amendments to the CAB TOR that expanded the scoring criteria and allow for greater differential between candidates. This is not recommended. It is not envisaged that the current situation (five applications for four places) will happen on a regular basis. The discretionary power recommended will allow for ad hoc decisions to be taken.

Next Steps

27. Assuming confirmation of the above, new members will be welcomed to the Board meeting on 13th October 2025.

Corporate and strategic implications

28. Strategic implications - The approach outlined in this report supports The Corporate Plan Objective of Dynamic Economic Growth and the Innovation and Growth Business Plan 2025/26.

29. Financial implications – No financial implications arise from the recommendations in this report.

30. Resource implications – No resource implications arise from the recommendations in this report.

31. Legal implications – No legal implications arise from the recommendations in this report.

32. Risk implications – No risk implications arise from the recommendations in this report.

33. Equalities implications – Members internally will have equal opportunity to access the CAB membership process. Consideration of diversity of thought expertise and perspective will drive composition across the Board membership.

34. Climate implications – No climate implications arise from the recommendations in this report.

35. Security implications – No security implications arise from the recommendations in this report.

Conclusion

36. It is within the Corporation's core purpose to steward the UK's financial centre and financial, tech, and professional services sectors through current and future challenges and opportunities. A strong and diverse CAB will allow us to fulfil this important role by combining the deep industry expertise that exists in the Membership and the external industry voices.

Background papers

Change to Competitiveness Advisory Board (CAB) Terms of Reference, December 2023, Policy and Resources Committee

Authors

Daniel O'Byrne
Strategic Engagement and Operations Director, Innovation and Growth
daniel.o'byrne@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Benjamin Dixon
Head of Policy, Office of the Policy Chairman
Benjamin.Dixon@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1 – Proposed Amended Terms of Reference for the Competitiveness Advisory Board

Composition

- Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee (Chair)
- Chair of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen (Deputy Chairman)
- Deputy Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee
- Deputy Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen
- Eight Members of the Court of Common Council with relevant expertise*
- The ability to co-opt up to eight external members flexibly and on an ad-hoc basis, in agreement with the Policy & Resources Committee

* In limited circumstances, the Chairman may, in consultation with the ex officio members, decide to exercise discretion over the number of internal Members appointed from the Court of Common Council, based on the scoring and recommendations provided by the officer panel. This will be presented to P&R for approval.

Role

The role of the Advisory Board is:

a. To provide informal guidance or direction to Innovation & Growth on the implementation of the Competitiveness strategy.

b. To provide expertise and insight to officers and Policy & Resources on the ingredients of global success of UK Financial and Professional Services, acting as an internal forum for the testing of ideas and prioritisation in the work of promotion and policy of the sector.

c. Offering additional support to the Lord Mayor and Chair of Policy and Resources as Ambassadors on the Innovation and Growth agenda.

d. To provide advice on the strategic deployment of hospitality as required.

This page is intentionally left blank

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee(s): Policy and Resource Committee – For Decision Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Sub-Committee – For information	**Dated:** 18/09/2025 25/9/2025
Subject: Faith in the City	**Public report:** For Decision
This proposal: • **delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes**	Diverse Engaged Communities (primary) Vibrant Thriving Destination (supporting) Dynamic Economic Growth (Supporting)
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	City Fund
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	Yes
Report of:	Dionne Corradine, Chief Strategy Officer
Report author:	Mark Gettleson, Director of Campaigns and Engagement (Interim)

Summary

This report recommends that Faith in the City be adopted as an official project of the City of London Corporation: to make the Square Mile the most faith-friendly business district in the world. In the context of the changing faith and belief profile of London and the City, it notes the significant research undertaken by Union Street Consulting to better understand that need. It proposes moving the project to a pilot stage in collaboration with business, including chaplaincy and religious literacy services and cultural programming. This would be funded through grant applications – using the City's convening power and officer support to facilitate – with a subscription-based model for businesses developed during the pilot. It proposes to convene a Faith in the City Advisory Group to support the long-term development of faith facilities and services.

Recommendations

Members are asked to:

- Note the research undertaken by Union Street Consulting, in which more than 1000 individuals participated.

- Endorse the adoption of Faith in the City as an official project of the City of London Corporation – with a vision to “to make the City of London the most faith friendly and religiously literate business community in the world, enabling it to attract and retain the very best global talent.”
- Agree that the City Corporation establish a Faith in the City Advisory Group to facilitate delivery, with membership drawn from elected Members, officers, faith leaders, business representatives and civil society. Membership will be proposed by officers with approval delegated to the Policy Chairman.
- Agree that City Corporation officers provide support for the pilot phase of this project and that the organisation use its convening power to secure funding and develop a longer-term vision for faith facilities and services.

Main Report

Background

1. National Statistics show that the religious makeup of London has changed in recent decades, and is likely to change further in the coming years. According to the 2021 Census, while 63% of Londoners over 75 were Christian and 18% followed a religion other than Christianity – those under 15 were just 36% Christian and 33% non-Christian. Overall, this is reflected in the makeup of the City workforce with the Annual Population Survey indicating a 69%-12% split in 2004-05 and a 35%-22% in 2024-25. The proportion of non-Christian City residents remains significantly below the London average at 13%, according to the Census.
2. Globally, Pew Research Centre shows that over 75% of the world’s population identifies with a faith, especially in key emerging markets for the City – such as South Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America.
3. While some localities, such as Canary Wharf, have had multi-faith services for many years, no equivalent provision exists in the Square Mile – which is home to more than 40 churches and one synagogue. Members have raised the importance of addressing this need with officers previously, as has the Bishop of London with the Policy Chairman.

Current Situation

4. Last year, Union Street Consulting received funding from the CIL Neighbourhood Fund to research the faith and belief needs of the Square Mile and put forward proposals for the future. This work was led by respected figures in the interfaith space: Sughra Ahmed (former Associate Dean of Religious Life at Stanford University), Rabbi Alex Goldberg (Rabbi of Guildford and Dean of Religious Life at the University of Surrey) and Michael Wakelin (former Head of Religion at the BBC). Their work has been supported by officers in the Campaigns and Community Engagement team in Communications, in particular through activating connections made through the City Belonging Project.

5. This research saw 885 City workers, residents and visitors with a range of age, seniority, sector and faith profiles complete a 15-minute online survey, the results of which were weighted by London's faith makeup.
6. Approximately 150 attended focus groups, with sessions held for key communities, including HR and EDI leaders, individual businesses, residents, Barts Hospital staff, and two each for Christian, Muslim, Dharmic (Hindu, Sikh, Buddhist and Jain) and Jewish faiths. Approximately 50 in-depth interviews were conducted, including with the Deputy Mayor for Business and Head of the Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales.
7. Key findings of the online research include:
    a. The importance of religion – with 87% of Muslim and 72% of Dharmic City commuters describing it as very important to their daily life, and 83% of Muslim City commuters practicing their faith multiple times a day.
    b. The City has a faith community challenge – with 52% of commuters of faith feeling very much part of a faith community where they live, but just 10% doing so in the City, including just 2% of non-Christians.
    c. The opportunity for greater provision – 37% of commuters of faith feel able to carry out all their faith activities in the Square Mile, including just 21% of non-Christians. More than half of faith commuters felt they would be somewhat or very more likely to spend time in the Square Mile with greater support for people for people of their faith, rising to approximately 8 in 10 Muslim and Dharmic commuters.
    d. Support for and interest in using multi-faith provision – with 47% of non-Christian commuters very supportive, and three quarters somewhat or very likely to use such a facility. Support was the highest among Muslim and Dharmic communities, who currently have no formal physical provision in the City, but also had majority support and interest from Christian and Jewish respondents.
    e. Employers need support navigating faith – a point echoed heavily in the focus groups – with specialist knowledge needed to be brought in externally. 56% of non-Christian commuters said their organisation had a lack of awareness around faith needs, including two thirds of Muslim and Dharmic commuters. Many also identified a lack of training and insufficient religious accommodations.
    f. Creating a more supportive environment is about spaces, support and community, reflecting the needs of each faith – while Muslim respondents emphasised the need for improved facilities (78%), Dharmic respondents called for more religious events (70%), and opportunities to network with people of their own faith (59%) – as did 63% of Jewish respondents. Specific issues were identified relating to Halal and Kosher food, with 79% of Muslim respondents and 73% of Jewish respondents with dietary needs citing limited access.

g. Residents were included in the survey and focus groups, and reported being well-served by the current provision.

Proposals

8. It is proposed to act on the research undertaken by Union Street Consulting, adopting Faith in the City as a City of London Corporation programme, and enter a pilot phase over the coming years to develop a sustainable and permanent model in collaboration with City businesses, civil society and our communities.
9. The pilot would learn both from the research conducted and best practice globally. It will be funded through applications to grant-giving organisations to provide seed funding, followed by the development of a subscription model for businesses.
10. City of London Corporation and its institutions would automatically become part of the pilot, which will include support for staff networks.
11. The pilot would involve a “centre without walls” to test models of chaplaincy, accreditation, events and visibility. Key elements would include:
    a. Chaplaincy and consultancy: A small team of expert multi-faith chaplains will provide pastoral support, workplace consultancy, and training in religious literacy.
    b. City of London Faith Standard: An accreditation scheme developed in collaboration with business to recognise those meeting high standards of religious inclusion.
    c. Events and visibility: A programme of flagship faith festivals and intercultural events will be curated, including support for existing programming.
    d. Information hub: Improved mapping of existing faith provision, signposting of chaplaincy services and dietary needs.
12. The work undertaken to date has attracted significant interest and support, including from the Bishop of London, Lambeth Palace, the Vatican’s Dicastery for Interreligious Dialogue, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, the Office of the Chief Rabbi, the Mayor of London, the Faith Leaders Community of Practice Conference and Executive at the UN Human Rights Office, former Faith Minister Lord Khan and Lord Rowan Williams. We also had positive engagement from Hindu, Sikh, and Muslim networks in City businesses and all relevant City Belonging networks.
13. Improving workplace faith provision has long been an area of interest for the sector, and there is significant opportunity to engage charitable and other funders who operate in this space. This engagement is already in process.
14. It is proposed to create a Faith in the City Advisory Group, with membership drawn from senior supporters of the project from across religious, business, philanthropic and political stakeholders, including City Corporation Members, with a range of faith traditions represented. Meeting quarterly, they will help act

as advocates for the programme, bring on new partners and provide strategic guidance in this complex area.

15. The longer-term ambition of this work is to develop a world-leading Faith and Belief Centre in the Square Mile with prayer spaces, chaplaincy offices, a food hub and cultural programming, tailored to the unique and changing needs of our worker and resident communities. Colleagues from the Environment Department have already been engaged to explore options for provision, potentially as part of a new development. The social value of such an initiative for any development is likely to be significant, and it provides an opportunity to work in partnership with business to provide new services for our community.

Key Data

16. Key data outlined above, including from the Census, Annual Population Survey and the research undertaken by Union Street Consulting. The results of the survey undertaken are included in the appendix.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

17. Provides significant support with Corporate Plan 2024-29 delivery, in particular the Diverse, Engaged Communities outcome, through increasing our engagement with City workers of faith and co-creating services with them and their employers that address their faith and belief needs. Residents will also benefit from access to events and festivals and the informational hub.

18. Additionally, provides support for Dynamic Economic Growth and Vibrant Thriving Destination, and supports the Destination City objective of creating an “inclusive and welcoming destination which attracts the next generation of talent”. Ensuring that the Square Mile is one of the most faith friendly and religiously literate business districts in the world will increase our global competitiveness for both companies and talent.

19. **Financial implications**
This project is actively pursuing funding options from grant-giving organisations and benefactors. Adoption of this project will strengthen bids that are currently being considered as well as future applications The proposed pilot phase will not be commenced until such funding has been received.

Resource implications

20. Officers in the Campaigns and Engagement team will continue to provide some administrative, communications and events support for this work, including as part of the City Belonging Project.

Legal implications

21. Personal information relating to faith is special category data under the GDPR and will continue to be held in a way that is safe, secure and compliant. It is intended to run the project out of the new corporate CRM as soon as it has been developed. In the interim, it will use the existing City Belonging project data infrastructure.

Risk implications

22. None identified.

Equalities implications

23. Strong positive impact, particularly for non-Christian communities currently under-served in the City. Meets the Public Sector Equality Duty by advancing inclusion across all protected faith and belief groups.

24. **Climate implications**
Creating more opportunities for faith activities in the City has the potential to reduce the number of unnecessary journeys taken to fulfil faith needs.

Security implications

25. The processes already in place to ensure safety and security at City Belonging events will be implemented for this project. With a current national threat level of "substantial", we will work in collaboration with City Corporation Security and City of London Police to assess whether additional measures will be needed.

Conclusion

26. The research undertaken makes clear the significant opportunity for improved multi-faith provision in the Square Mile – and to become the most faith-friendly business district in the world. Adopting Faith in the City as an official project of the City of London Corporation allows us to use our leadership and convening power to bring together faith, business and civil society leaders to deliver on key strategic objectives while adapting to a changing workforce. There is significant opportunity to further engage external partners, including grant-giving organisations, for support on this project.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Faith in the City Presentation
Appendix 2 – Faith in the City Survey Dataset (Weighted and Rebased)

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committees: Community and Children's Services Committee – For decision Policy and Resources Committee – For decision	**Dates:** 17/09/2025 18/09/2025
Subject: North East London Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant Delivery Proposal	**Public report:** For Decision
This proposal: • **delivers Corporate Plan 2024–2029 outcome:**	Delivering Excellent Services
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	NA
What is the source of Funding?	MHCLG Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant (RSPARG)
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	NA
Report of:	Judith Finlay – Executive Director, Community and Children's Services
Report author:	Will Norman – Head of Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeping

Summary

This report seeks approval for the City of London to act as the lead authority, commissioning body and administrator for the Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant (RSPARG) on behalf of the North East London (NEL) sub-region.

The proposal covers an initial period of FY 2025/26; however, Members are also asked to consider the possibility of in-year increases to grant funding and approval for an extended period pending confirmation of further grant funding for 2026/27 and beyond.

RSPARG grant funding is provided to individual local authorities and sub-regions through a ring-fenced section 31 grant. The funding should be used to provide vital single

homelessness and rough sleeping services, to support individuals sleeping rough, at risk of sleeping rough, or at risk of returning to rough sleeping

The proposal sets out the new governance and oversight arrangements required to safely deliver the 2025/26 grant on behalf of the seven NEL local authorities, plus the City of London.

Recommendations

Members of Community and Children's Services Committee are asked to note the report and endorse the proposal for consideration and approval by the Policy and Resources Committee.

Members of Policy and Resources Committee are asked to note the report and approve the proposal.

Main Report

Background

1. The Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government's (MHCLG's) Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant (RSPARG) was first awarded in 2024/25 and is split between direct awards to individual local authorities and awards to sub-regions. The City of London is part of a NEL sub-region which includes seven boroughs and the City of London.
2. The RSPARG was preceded by the previous government's Rough Sleeping Initiative (RSI) grant programme. The City of London has been in receipt of RSI funding since 2017/18, with the most recent award being a three-year award covering 2022/23 to 2024/25 and totalling £3,986,399.
3. The purpose of the RSPARG is to enable local authorities to continue vital rough sleeping services, to support individuals sleeping rough, at risk of sleeping rough, or at risk of returning to rough sleeping. It provides local authorities with the flexibility to determine the most effective services, driven by local need, to be delivered in line with the national priority impacts set out in the grant conditions.
4. The RSPARG is paid in a single tranche as a Section 31 ring-fenced payment. The grant is subject to a single, light-touch mid-year delivery report and an end-of-year declaration.
5. The current NEL sub-region was established in 2023/24 with funding from MHCLG. Five funding streams have been allocated to the sub-region across 2023–2025. All were spent and delivered significant additional interventions above those that boroughs had already individually committed to.
6. The role of the NEL sub-region is to foster a closer working relationships across local authorities through shared practice and resources. The NEL boroughs are Hackney, Tower Hamlets, Newham, Barking and Dagenham, Waltham Forest, Havering and Redbridge. Each local authority attends monthly meetings chaired by the NEL Co-ordinator. The meetings are also attended by representatives from London Councils, MHCLG and health partners. Examples of work commissioned and delivered through NEL to date includes:

- A sub-regional reciprocal accommodation agreement between six out of eight boroughs
- A five-month winter hub for NEL boroughs based in Newham
- Expansion of specialist psychotherapy outreach from three to five boroughs
- Expansion of homeless health workstreams across primary care, speech and language therapy, harm reduction and personalised health budgets
- A Private Rented Sector (PRS) scheme with access to rent in advance, deposits, landlord incentives and access to suitable and affordable PRS properties
- Continuation of the mental health outreach service in NEL
- Funding for accommodation stays for clients accessing immigration advice.

Current Position

7. The Government's new RSPARG programme was publicly announced on 18 December 2024. The initial award for 2025/26 includes £1,373,509 individual allocation to the City of London and £767,448 allocated to the NEL sub-region. Payment was made on 1 May 2025.
8. Service delivery funded by the City's individual RSPARG award is managed locally by the Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service in co-operation with colleagues in Community and Children's Services, Chamberlain's Department, Commercial Services, and Comptroller's Office.
9. For the purpose of this report, Members' attention is drawn to the NEL sub-region element of the RSPARG award, which for 2025/26 totals £767,448.
10. In previous years the MHCLG has occasionally topped-up an initial grant award payments with additional funding that is required to be committed in-year. Members are asked to consider this possibility arising in 2025/26 (please see Non-public Appendix 1).
11. The 2025/26 award has been provisionally allocated to Redbridge, pending a decision on which NEL authority is best placed to assume the role of lead authority. Redbridge is not in a position to take future procurement workstreams forward. Considering this, all seven NEL boroughs and MHCLG endorse the City of London's proposal to assume the role of lead authority.
12. A fixed-term post located in Redbridge acts as a Sub-regional Co-ordinator. The post holder convenes a monthly meeting, commissions new services, monitors and tracks existing service delivery, acts as a contract monitoring officer, and is responsible for financial monitoring returns to MHCLG.
13. The City Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service currently liaises regularly with MHCLG Rough Sleeping Advisors, and existing arrangements are in place for expenditure declarations against City of London's specific allocations to be approved by the Section 151 Officer.
14. The Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service is a regular contributor to the existing NEL sub-region work group; however, the sub-region currently lacks comprehensive governance and oversight arrangements. A draft work plan for

delivering proposed activity in 2025/26 has been prepared by the sub-region contributors in advance of a lead authority being confirmed.

15. An opportunity exists to more closely align the strategic objectives of the NEL rough sleeping sub-region with the NEL Integrated Care Board (ICB). The City of London's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service is already engaged with the NEL ICB Homelessness Health Strategy at place and neighbourhood level.

Options

16. **Option 1** – the City of London will act as the lead authority for the NEL sub-region. The City of London will be the recipient of RSPARG funding for 2025/26, with consideration given to extending this arrangement to align with confirmation of future funding for 2026/27 and beyond.

17. Each NEL borough will submit their own management information data on the Government's data collection portal (Delta) confirming the number of people sleeping rough. The City of London will submit a spend declaration at the end of the grant period setting out the total amount spent by the authority on behalf of the sub-region. The City of London Section 151 Officer will approve spend declarations.

18. The City of London and an MHCLG Rough Sleeping Advisor will identify a senior officer (Housing Director or similar) from another authority in the sub-region to act as a programme sponsor.

19. The Sub-regional Co-ordinator post will either move from Redbridge under a secondment, or a recruitment process will be required to identify a suitable candidate. The post will report to the Head of Homelessness, Prevention and Rough Sleeping.

20. The Programme Sponsor, Sub-regional Co-ordinator and City's Head of Homelessness, Prevention and Rough Sleeping will anchor a strategic delivery board (also including an MHCLG representative and others to be confirmed) to provide governance and oversight of procurement decisions, contractor performance and MHCLG communication. NEL boroughs will sign up to a memorandum of understanding drafted in collaboration with City of London legal services. This addresses the lack of governance under the current arrangement.

21. **Option 2** – the City of London will not assume a lead authority function for the NEL sub-region. Redbridge will retain the budget and the role until such time as an alternative arrangement can be designed and implemented. The City of London will sustain its participation in the NEL sub-region as an equal with the other boroughs involved.

Proposal

22. Option 1 – the City of London will act as the lead authority and commissioning body for the RSPARG grant for the period 2025/26. Should this prove successful and, if the RSPARG grant programme is extended beyond 2025/26 (the most probable outcome is a three-year programme), the commitment should be extended to align with available funding.

Key Data, Facts and Figures[1]

[1] Source – Combined Homelessness and Information Network (CHAIN)

23. **Table 1 – Summary data**

Total rough sleepers seen in Greater London 2024/25	13,231
City as a % of total rough sleepers in Greater London	6.64%
City as a % of rough sleeprs in NEL sub-region	29.25%
NEL sub-region as a % of total rough sleepers in Greater London	22.29%

24. **Table 2 – Total rough sleepers in NEL sub-region by borough, 2024/25**

Barking & Dagenham	144
City of London	878
Hackney	298
Havering	67
Newham	545
Redbridge	285
Tower Hamlets	546
Waltham Forest	239
Total	3002

25. **Table 3 – Single night snapshot count of rough sleepers, November 2024**

Barking & Dagenham	6
City of London	86
Hackney	20
Havering	9
Newham	28
Redbridge	19
Tower Hamlets	39
Waltham Forest	60
Total	267

Corporate & Strategic Implications

26. Financial implications – Option 1 is funded from the RSPARG programme and funding is confirmed for 2025/26. Option 1 does not anticipate the City of London contributing any funding. No decision has been made by MHCLG regarding an extended RSPARG programme for 2026/27 and beyond, and confirmation is not expected until later in 2025.

27. Resource implications – Consideration will be given to the resource implications in Community and Children's Services, Chamberlain's Department, Commercial Services, and Comptroller's Office. Grant funding will be used to add short- to medium-term capacity.

28. Legal implications – There are legal risks inherent in managing procurement projects for third parties, however these can be mitigated by clear contract language and the City does have experience in managing similar pan-London contracts. Data protection implications, and data sharing implications must be considered for the project. In this respect, the City's Information Governance Team have recommended that a data mapping exercise be undertaken, and a Data Protection Impact Assessment be completed in accordance with Article 35 of the UK GDPR.

29. Risk implications – There are inherent risks in acting as a lead commissioner in procurement and commissioning in terms of market interest/availability, provider failure, reputational risk by association, with service closure and government funding that can be subject to change. Risks will be mitigated through the City of London Corporation's contract management arrangements, Commercial Services and legal input. These areas are all to be funded by the RSPARG programme. The requirement to commit spending in FY 2025/26 increases the risk of returning an underspend in the end of year financial declaration. MHCLG notes the challenges faced in assuming a lead authority role at this stage of the financial year and acknowledges the practical implications. The NEL Strategic Delivery Board will provide governance and oversight arrangements. The proposal echoes similar arrangements already in place in delivering the London Sexual Health Partnership and Inpatient Detoxification programmes delivered by Community and Children's Services. If Option 2 is preferred, there is a risk that operational activity to help tackle rough sleeping in the City will not be procured, and therefore rough sleeping numbers may increase.

30. Equalities implications – Rough sleeping populations are among the most disadvantaged and underserved by public services. Option 1 will help the City of London and the NEL sub-region address these issues with greater strategic focus.

31. Climate implications – none
32. Security implications – none

Conclusion

33. The NEL sub-region was awarded £767,448 of grant funding from the Government's RSPARG programme in May 2025. In-year increases in grant funding as well as an extended grant programme from 2026/27 are possibilities.

34. The RSPARG fund is allocated to help local authorities tackle rising levels of rough sleeping through prevention and relief workstreams procured using grants allocated directly to housing authorities and sub-regions.

35. There is currently no lead authority within the NEL sub-region to assume responsibility for using RSPARG funding to procure activity that helps the City of London and NEL sub-region tackle street homelessness.

36. Option 1 in the proposal section of the report sets out how the City of London will act as lead authority. The core responsibilities include liaison with MHCLG regarding progress in grant delivery, procurement activity, contract monitoring and expenditure declarations.

37. Additional resourcing to the City's Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Service, Procurement, Commissioning and Legal services will be funded from the grant and there are no additional costs to the City of London in acting as lead authority.

38. Governance and oversight will be provided by a Strategic Delivery Board chaired by an independent senior housing professional from within the NEL sub-region. NEL member authorities will sign up to a memorandum of understanding.

Appendices

- Non-public Appendix 1 - North East London Rough Sleeping Prevention and Recovery Grant Delivery Proposal

Will Norman
Head of Homelessness, Prevention and Rough Sleeping

T: 020 7332 1994
E: will.norman@cityoflondon.gov.uk

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

City of London Corporation Committee Report

Committee(s): Policy and Resources Committee – *For Decision* Court of Common Council – *For Information*	**Dated:** 18 September 2025 9 October 2025
Subject: Annual Report of the Panel of Independent Persons	**Public report:** For Decision
This proposal: • **delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes**	All
Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?	No
If so, how much?	N/A
What is the source of Funding?	N/A
Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain's Department?	N/A
Report of:	Town Clerk
Report author:	Kate Doidge, Town Clerk's Department

Summary

This annual report presents activity undertaken by the Panel of Independent Persons in relation to both Complaints received under the Members' Code of Conduct and applications for dispensation since May 2024. This report has been placed by the Town Clerk's office in the usual format, in order to facilitate submission to the Member Development and Standards Sub-Committee and the Policy and Resources Committee ahead of its presentation to the Court of Common Council, where it will need to go as a report of the Policy and Resources Committee given that neither the Panel nor the Sub-Committee have any direct reporting mechanism.

This report also contains details of the Panel's recent recruitment activity and a request for a review of the Independent Person's day rate.

Recommendation(s)

Members of the Policy & Resources Committee are asked to:

- Note the report.
- Consider the request from the Panel regarding the daily attendance allowance, and whether it recommends an uplift to the daily attendance allowance in line with Consumer Price Index (CPI) (paragraphs 16 – 25).

Main Report

Background

1. The Panel of Independent Persons (The Panel) was initially established by the City of London Corporation (the Corporation) by way of Court of Common Council Resolution on 14 January 2021. This was following an independent Governance Review of the City Corporation, which proposed the establishment of an Independent Panel composed only of independent persons (convening as smaller sub-Panels of three), to receive allegations of misconduct under the Code of Conduct, determine whether to investigate, present findings to the Court, and hear any appeal. The Panel also has responsibility for making recommendations as to whether or not dispensations should be granted or refused.

2. The Panel was formally established in July 2021, initially of nine members, with a further three members approved in October 2023, to bring the Panel to a total of twelve to ensure that adequate panel members were available to cover all necessary stages of a complaint noting that no one Independent Person may sit on more than one stage of the same complaint, but also to take into account availability and any potential conflicts of interest.

3. Details of all current members of the Panel can be found at Appendix 1. The Panel's current terms of reference are attached at Appendix 2 of this report, drafted by the Panel and subsequently received by the Court in October 2022.

4. Following the resignation of two Panel Members, the Panel currently sits at ten members. During its annual meeting, the Panel agreed that two existing Independent Persons would also 'rotate off' the Panel, ending their terms at the end of 2025, and allow for the recruitment of three (now four) new Independent Persons to the Panel. A recommendation on the recruitment of four new members of the Panel is envisaged to be presented to the Court of Common Council by December 2025, following a recruitment campaign to be held over the Autumn.

5. This report is being used by the Panel as the means of communicating its activity and the activity of all Assessment, Hearing, Appeal and Dispensations Sub-panels called to sit during the period May 2024 to June 2025.

6. This report was first considered by the Member Development and Standards Sub-Committee at its meeting on 8 July 2025 and has been updated in line with their observations.

Current Position

Operation of the Panel

7. The Panel operates within the framework of its terms of reference and all Panel members agree to follow the Nolan Principles and also the Code of Conduct in place for members and co-opted members of the Corporation. Each of the Panel members Register of Interests can be found online. The Panel was chaired by Amanda Orchard until June 2025, with Robert Coyle chairing the Panel from

June 2025. Tom Ketteley serves as Deputy Chair from June 2025. He replaces former Deputy Chair Gary Rogers who resigned in January 2025.

8. Eight full Panel meeting have taken place since July 2021. Agendas for these meetings are approved by the Chair. All full Panel meetings have been quorate in line with the Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference are regularly reviewed to ensure that they remain fit for purpose. The Panel currently arranges an annual meeting, with any further meetings arranged to suit organisational requirements. The Panel also take the opportunity to share best practice and undertake training relevant to their roles at full meetings. The most recent meeting was kindly hosted by the Chief Commoner in February 2025.

9. Administrative and legal support to the Panel and all sub-panels is provided through the Town Clerk's Department, and Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department, respectively. Where there may a perception that the Monitoring Officer's team might be in any way conflicted, or it is otherwise considered beneficial to obtain independent legal advice, external Counsel are called upon to assist the Panel.

Matters considered by the Panel from May 2024 – June 2025.

Dispensations

10. The Panel have been asked to make recommendations on two applications for a dispensation in this reporting period. The Panel would like to use this platform to encourage all seeking dispensations to complete the necessary applications in sufficient detail with reference to the guidance provided and in sufficient time so as to enable decisions to be taken.

11. The outcome of the recommendations for all requests for a dispensation are published in the Register of Dispensations online. This also includes the certain types of straightforward requests for a dispensation that are granted by the Town Clerk via delegated authority, and those requests granted under urgency procedures by the Monitoring Officer.

Alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct

12. The Panel has considered one formal complaint in this reporting period, summarised below.

13. In accordance with the Complaints Procedure, the first determination at Assessment must be whether or not a complaint is admissible and meets the following tests:
    (i) It is a complaint against one or more named members of the Corporation;
    (ii) The named member was in office at the time of the alleged conduct and the code of conduct was in force at the time;
    (iii) The complaint, if proven, would be a breach of the code of conduct under which the member was operating at the time of the alleged misconduct;
    (iv) The complaint is about something that happened or came to light within the last three months, or is connected to alleged misconduct within the

last three months, unless there are reasonable grounds for the complaint not having been made within that time period.

If the complaint fails one or more of these tests, it is deemed 'inadmissible' and cannot be investigated as a breach of the code and the complainant will be informed by the Town Clerk that no further action will be taken in respect of this complaint.

14. Should a Member be found in breach of the Code, there are a number of sanctions available to the Panel to recommend. These must be reasonable and proportionate in all of the circumstances. The available sanctions for a breach of the code of conduct are:-
    (i) censure;
    (ii) withdrawal of Corporation hospitality for an appropriate period;
    (iii) removal from one or more committees;
    (iv) other action.

15. There is no power to impose any alternative sanctions, although the willingness of a member to co-operate in the matters listed below may have a bearing on any sanction that is imposed:-
    (i) that the member submits a written apology in a form specified;
    (ii) that the member undertakes specified training;
    (iii) that the member participates in such conciliation as is specified.

Matter No.	***Source of Complaint***	***Alleged breaches of the Code***	***Outcome/Status***
03 - 24	*Officers v Member*	*Failing to act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias; failing to actively promote and robustly support the Nolan principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs; failing to value your colleagues and officers of the Corporation and engage with them in an appropriate manner and one that underpins the mutual respect that is essential to good local governance; bringing your office or authority into disrepute; failing to*	*An initial request for anonymity was rejected by the Assessment Panel due to a lack of exceptional circumstances. A number of named officers then came forward. The Assessment Panel subsequently determined that, whilst the complaint was admissible, no further action should be taken given that the Subject Member had apologised.*

		uphold the Corporation's obligations under the Equality Act 2010 by promoting equality, and not discriminating unlawfully against any person on the grounds of race, gender, disability, religion or belief, sexual orientation or age.	

Request from the Panel to Review the Day Rate.

16. At present, the Independent Persons have a daily attendance allowance of £300, and reasonable travel expenses are also reimbursed.

17. The Panel would like to use this platform to request that the day rate be reviewed, to ensure that it remains proportionate and appropriate. The current rate has remained unchanged since the Panel's inception in January 2021. Members are asked to consider what action they wish to take pertaining to this request.

18. At its meeting on 8 July 2025, the Member Development and Standards Sub-Committee considered this report, and the request from the Panel.

19. It was suggested to recommend to the Policy & Resources Committee that there be an uplift to the current daily attendance allowance in line with Consumer Price Index (CPI). Members of the Member Development and Standards Sub-Committee were agreeable to this recommendation and considered it fair and appropriate as it was in line with the recent uplift given to Elected Members of the City of London Corporation. This would bring the daily attendance allowance to £312.30.

20. There is no specific allocated budget for the daily attendance allowance for Independent Persons – however, for Members reference, the 2024/25 spend was £2,411.66. Whilst the budget cannot be increased mid-year, the improved processes in relation to the Complaints Procedure (namely, the informal resolution mechanisms) mean that officers believe that the uplift could be met within the current 2025/26 budget if Members felt this was appropriate.

21. Should Members agree to the recommendation that the daily attendance allowance by uplifted in line with CPI, officers shall monitor to ensure that the current budget would be able to meet the level of complaints received. Should there be an increase in complaints, the budget would have to be reviewed for 2026/27.

22. Members of the Member Development and Standards Sub-Committee also requested financial benchmarking for broadly similar roles as the City Corporations' Panel:

Organisation	Allowance
Greater London Authority (GLA)	Appoint 2 Independent Persons and with effect from May 2024, they received an allowance of £1,250 per annum.
Camden Council	Appoints 2 Independent Persons, receiving an allowance of £1,175 per annum
Hackney Council	An annual allowance of £557.05
London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham	A flat rate of £642.01 per annum
Islington Council	Appoints 2 persons, receiving an annual allowance of £1,025 per annum
Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea	3 Independent Persons, received a =n annual allowance of £2,230
London Borough of Lambeth	An annual allowance of £1,061 per annum, 2 Independent Persons
London Borough of Lewisham	6 persons co-opted to the Standards Committee, receiving an annual allowance of £623
London Borough of Southwark	3 Independent Persons, receiving an annual allowance of £1,394
Tower Hamlets Council	£136 for attendance at any meeting or conference / training event on behalf of and authorised by the Council
London Borough of Wandsworth	£400 per annum each for 2 Independent Persons
Westminster City Council	£400 per annum each for 3 Independent Persons
Independent Member on Greater Manchester Police and Crime Fire Panel	Annual allowance of £930 (for 12-14 days per year)
Independent Member on Cumbria Police, Fire and Crime Panel	Annual allowance of £800

23. There appears to be a bias toward remunerating on an annual basis for these types of roles. However, for the City Corporation, an uplifted daily rate might still provide better value for money.

24. Members are therefore asked to consider whether it would recommend an uplift in the Independent Person daily attendance allowance in line with CPI.

Conclusion

25. Over the almost four-year period that the Panel has been active, a number of matters have been considered and refined as part of the formal Complaints Procedure now in operation, the latest of which have been presented in this report.

26. Compared to the previous year's report, the Panel have had fewer matters to consider (although the previous report covered a longer period of time). This may be connected to a successful deployment of the informal resolution mechanisms (with external mediation if agreeable by all parties) that are expressly included in the Complaints Procedure. There is also now a requirement that Member-on-Member complainants first explore a resolution with either the Chief Commoner, or the Chair of General Purposes Committee of Aldermen or the Chair of Nominations Committee of Aldermen, at an early stage.

27. The Panel's continued aim is for the complaints procedure they operate to be effective and efficient, accessible and widely understood by both members of the public and members of the Corporation alike.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Panel Membership and Terms of Appointment
- Appendix 2 – Panel Terms of Reference

Kate Doidge
Town Clerk's Department
T: 020 3834 8881
E: kate.doidge@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Appendix 1

PANEL MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

The current Independent Panel Members are:

Name	
Miranda Carruthers-Watt	Appointed 2021
Robert Coyle	Chair from June 2025 Appointed 2021
Chris Fraser	*Until the end of 2025* Appointed 2021
Amina Hossain	Appointed 2023
Tom Ketteley	Deputy Chair from June 2025 Appointed 2021
Karen McArthur	Appointed 2023
Amanda Orchard	Appointed 2021
Rahul Sinha	Appointed 2021
Phillip Thicknesse	*Until the end of 2025* Appointed 2021
Atiyyah Younis	Appointed 2021
Vacancy	
Vacancy	
Vacancy	
Vacancy	

Appendix 2

PANEL OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS

Terms of Reference

Functions and Authority of the Panel

The Independent Persons Panel (the Panel) was established by the City of London Corporation Court of Common Council (the Corporation) by way of Court of Common Council Resolution on 14 January 2021.

The purpose and powers of the Panel is to establish and administer a Complaints Process and to also deal with the granting of Dispensations (the Scheme).

The Panel is to independently consider complaints made by anyone against an elected or co-opted member of the Corporation.

The Panel will also consider granting Dispensations for Members to participate in a particular item of business at a City Corporation meeting where a disclosable pecuniary interest exists that must be disclosed, relating to in any matter that is being considered.

The Panel has authority to develop the Policy on the process for dealing with complaints referring to any Sanctions that may be applied. The Panel is also authorised to consider Dispensations under the Scheme.

The Panel is responsible for providing from its membership, the persons to form Assessment, Hearing and Appeal Sub-panels, required to investigate and consider complaints, by informal and/or formal process under the Scheme.

The Panel considers all complaints referred to the Scheme and where formal process is followed will recommend to the Corporation the final outcome for approval. The Panel also issues the deciding determination on dispensation applications.

The Panel is responsible for developing a Policy for Publication of the outcomes of complaints, as recommended to the Corporation.

Membership

The Panel is formed of up to twelve members in total, comprised of all independent members.

All Panel members agree to follow the Nolan Principles and also the Code of Conduct in place for members and co-opted members of the Corporation.

The Panel will maintain a Register of Interests for all independent members which will be published on the City Corporation's Library webpages and updated regularly.

Independent panel members are selected by the Corporation. All appointments are for terms of up to two years, with a maximum of three terms being served.

Chair and Deputy Chair

The members of the Panel shall elect one of its members as Chair, and another member as Deputy Chair, both for a period of 12 months which can be renewed for a maximum of up to 36 months

Where the Chair is not present at a meeting, or is conflicted, the Deputy Chair will take the Chair for the meeting or for any conflicted item

Quorum, Frequency and Records of Panel Meetings

The Panel quorum is five.

The Panel will as standard meet annually each municipal year, but meetings may be cancelled or called more frequently if required.

The Panel shall hold additional meetings as required to deal with any business arising at the request of the Executive of the Corporation or at the request of two members of the Panel.

At least three weeks' notice of the time, date and venue of each Panel meeting shall be provided to all members. All relating paperwork will be issued to all no later than five clear working days before each meeting wherever possible.

It is acceptable for routine business to be conducted electronically.

The Secretariat of the Corporation will prepare minutes and provide each member with a copy. Such minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting and, subject to any amendment, agreed and will be signed by the Chair. The amendment of minutes shall not affect the validity of decisions taken by the panel in the meeting to which the minutes relate.

Duties

The Panel is responsible for establishing and maintaining a Complaints Process and applying the Sanctions Policy, both of which should be reviewed regularly

The Panel is also responsible for considering applications for dispensations submitted by Members.

The complaints process and any guidance will be available to all who want to make a complaint.

The Dispensations form and related guidance will be available to all who wish to submit an application for consideration.

The Panel, and its Sub-panels, are to have regard to the Complaints Process; any Sanctions specified in legislation or in any Sanctions Policy; the Policy and Guidance on the granting of dispensations under the Localism Act 2011; and the Members Code of Conduct when dealing with any complaints or dispensation requests before it.

All formal complaints and/or appeal recommendations will be referred to the Corporation for oversight approval. After the matter has been addressed by the Corporation the outcome will be published where the process requires this.

A recommendation or other outcome at any stage of the complaints process, will be recorded in writing and reported to the next full Panel meeting after the end of the full process for that complaint.

All determinations made by the Corporation will also be reported back to the Panel.

The Panel will adhere to best practice in terms of managing data and do so in line with the City of London Corporation Data Subject Rights Policy.

The Panel will produce an Annual Report that will be published.

Sub-Panels

Each Sub-panel will be comprised of up to three persons.

Appointments to Sub-panels will be undertaken on a rota basis. The Panel can select particular members for a complaint to replace any rota allocations, if specific skills are required to deal with a particular complaint. Also allocations should ensure, as far as possible, a mix of persons to each Sub-panel to reflect the range of diversity within the panel.

A panel member cannot be part of more than one Sub-panel for each individual complaint.

Voting mechanism

The Panel or any Sub-panel, may vote on and determine any matter arising at the meeting and each member present at the meeting shall have one vote.

Decisions of the Panel or any Sub-panel shall be by simple majority of the votes cast (excluding any abstentions).

Approved February 2025.

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Agenda Item 17

Document is Restricted

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank