

RESOURCE ALLOCATION SUB (POLICY AND RESOURCES) COMMITTEE

Friday, 19 November 2021

Minutes of the meeting of the Resource Allocation Sub (Policy and Resources)
Committee held at Committee Rooms, 2nd Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Friday, 19
November 2021 at 2.00 pm

Present

Members:

Deputy Catherine McGuinness (Chair)	Christopher Hayward
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Deputy Chairman)	Shravan Joshi
Deputy Keith Bottomley	Jeremy Mayhew
Anne Fairweather	Deputy Tom Sleigh
Tracey Graham	

In Attendance Virtually

Tijs Broeke
Deputy James Thomson

Officers:

Caroline Al-Beyerty	-	Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer
Paul Double	-	City Remembrancer
Gregory Moore	-	Town Clerk's Department
Dianne Merrifield	-	Chamberlain's Department
Paul Wilkinson	-	City Surveyor
Emma Moore	-	Chief Operating Officer
Sonia Virdee	-	Chamberlain's Department
James Lee	-	Central Grants Unit
Peter Young	-	Corporate Property Group Director
Mark Jarvis	-	Head of Finance
Sanjay Odedra	-	Head of Media (Financial Services)
Leanne Murphy	-	Town Clerk's Department

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Tijs Broeke, Sir Michael Snyder, Karina Dostalova and Alderman Sir David Wootton.

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

There were none.

3. MINUTES

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

Matters arising

A Member raised a point of order, asking why agenda Item 12 was not being considered in public session as the content did not appear to be commercially

sensitive. The Chair advised that it was deemed appropriate for this report to be discussed in non-public as the decision might impact on the Schools fees.

The Town Clerk confirmed that, legally, the application of the Local Government Act 1972 did not apply to the Independent Schools and CoLAT so was not subject to the rules around transparency. As this was private business, it was deemed necessary to be considered in non-public session.

The following legal advice was also read by the Town Clerk for clarity:

The City of London Corporation is the proprietor of the Schools acting in its general corporate capacity, and their property is held as part of the City's Estate. The costs attributable to the running of the Schools are met from parents' fees and are otherwise funded from the City Corporation's own funds, City's Cash. The City Corporation is not acting in its capacity as a local authority as proprietor of any of the three independent Schools, which are classified under the Education Acts as being within the Independent sector.

The provisions of Part VA and Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (Public Access to Meetings and Documents) do not apply to business of committees of the Court of Common Council in discharging the City Corporation's functions as proprietor of the three Schools. These statutory provisions only apply to the City Corporation in the discharge of its functions as a local authority and a police authority.

It was noted that the application of the Local Government Act was defined by whether a Committee was funded by City's Cash and City Fund. This distinction was often clear, but some committees had mixed functions and therefore subject to mixed funding. The Town Clerk confirmed that the City Corporation had discretion to apply or disapply conditions of Act, and whilst agendas could be split based on where these fit, the Policy & Resources Committee considered this matter in 2013 and 2016 and rejected this approach. Members acknowledged this would be complicated but felt it might be timely to reconsider this approach.

Members discussed whether those participating virtually should be allowed to participate in the non-public discussions. Due to the size of the Sub-Committee, the Chair agreed for those Members joining virtually to be able to speak but not vote on this occasion.

4. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY NEIGHBOURHOOD FUND - APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chief Grants Officer and Director of City Bridge Trust regarding applications for the Community Infrastructure Levy Neighbourhood Fund (CILNF).

RESOLVED, that Members:-

- Note the approved and rejected grants under delegated authority at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in October 2021 (Appendix 1);
- Approve the grant recommended to 'New Diorama' at a meeting of the CILNF Officer Panel in October 2021 (Appendix 2);
- Note the current position of the CILNF with respect to funds available and upcoming reporting.

5. **CAPITAL FUNDING UPDATE**

The Sub-Committee received a report of the Chamberlain providing a Capital Funding Update.

RESOLVED, that Members:-

- Agree to apply the 'one-in, one-out' approach to reallocate £30k from savings on the PRSCMS project to provide top-up funding to take the Barbican Renewal project through to the end of 2021/22;
- Review the schemes summarised in Table 1 and, particularly in the context of the current financial climate, to confirm their continued essential priority for release of funding at this time; and accordingly;
- Agree the release of up to £2.648m for the schemes in Table 1 from the reserves of City Fund and City's Cash as appropriate, subject to the required gateway approvals;
- Note that in order to maintain sound financial discipline a review of unallocated central project funding provisions will be brought to Members following discussions taking place at the bi-lateral meetings in January 2022

6. **CAPITAL FUNDING - PRIORITISATION OF 2022/23 ANNUAL CAPITAL BIDS - INITIAL REVIEW**

The Sub-Committee considered a report of the Chamberlain regarding an initial review Capital Funding Prioritisation of 2022/23 Annual Capital Bids.

Members were informed that Senior Officers had debated and prioritised the bids into a traffic light system of Green (demonstrates the essential criteria), Amber (essential criteria less clear) and Red (does not demonstrate essential criteria/not essential to do now). The list had already been challenged by the Chair and Deputy Chairman who made some adjustments.

Members considered the proposed Green/Amber/Red Bids and approved them all. The following comments were made on individual bids on the Amber and Red lists:

- **Barbican Centre - Repairs to roof, expansion joint repairs and drainage and water systems** – it was felt a holistic approach to all works at the Centre, including the podium and the Renewal Project, was

needed. Members were happy for Officers to take additional time to explore this.

- **DCCS - Library Management System** – it was hoped a plan would be developed to maximise a single management system.
- **Walbrook Wharf Feasibility Study - 2027 & beyond** – this project was considered too premature to be Green. The Corporate Property Group Director felt it was deceptive to refer to the project post-2027 as Officers hoped to be ready with planning consent, a waste management system decision and aspiration to introduce rivers by 2027 at the latest. A plea was made to the Sub-Committee for some funding to be made available to move the project forward.

The Deputy Chairman, after having discussions with the Chair for CASC, thought it unlikely to incur increased costs if the project was delayed for a year, and Members were content provided it was Green by next year.

In response to queries, it was confirmed this was to undertake sufficient research next year into waste management and explore river freight potential along with surveys which required strategic direction to be agreed in light of ongoing maintenance and repairs to the current depot and net zero targets by 2027. Officers agreed to come back to the Sub-Committee with a revised and lower bid.

- **IT - Data Repository/Warehouse** – a Member noted the complexity of the subject and felt it would be helpful to invite Officers involved in individual projects to provide the Sub-Committee with relevant information, as often Members were only aware of issues and implications if the project fell within their own committee areas.

An Officer confirmed IT issues had been included within the TOM process and focus was given to what has to happen rather than what would be nice to happen. Officers agree to invite Chief Officers to the meeting considering Amber and Red projects.

- **Guildhall Complex Post Covid New Ways of Working - Stage 2 works and furniture** – Members acknowledged the difficulties as it was not yet clear where to aim. Officers confirmed the project had begun looking and the future of North and West wings of Guildhall, and clear direction on the shape of the project was still needed.
- **St Paul's Gyratory** – the Chair read comments received in advance of the meeting from a Member who asked if a) Officers could split out the different elements of the Gyratory project to get clarity on what costs and timeline for realisation is of each element; b) endorsement of the recommendation that a “minimal allocation to fund investigations to inform the central funding requirement” is approved to be signed off under delegated authority to ensure the process progresses whilst not yet moving into Green for 2022/23, and c) instruct Officers to engage

with developers of 81 Newgate Street and other local projects to get clearer understanding of the level of their financial contributions to improvements to the public realm. Members and Officers were supportive of the suggestions and approved the delegated authority.

- **St Paul's Cathedral Re-Lighting** – a Member noted that there were a number of upcoming important anniversaries plus other events with St Paul's at the heart of national events. Currently, half of the dome was not lit and there were general health and safety concerns. The Member asked if this could be considered as a Capital Bid, subject to necessary conditions, e.g. that it be made clear the revenue costs for lighting be borne from revenue at the Cathedral.

The Chair declared an interest in St Paul's noting that she sat on the Cathedral's Council.

Members discussed the informal agreement and questioned what the City Corporation's responsibilities were, the S106 obligations and why the Cathedral were not financing the costs as it was not a Corporation owned building and the Cathedral had its own funding stream. It was also noted that there were other funding options available including bids to the National Lottery Heritage Fund.

A Member advised that St Paul's had struggled during lockdown and was only back to 40% of donations experienced pre-pandemic. The Member also noted that the Corporation received a secondary income from people visiting the Cathedral.

Members were concerned by the vagueness of the agreement and the potential for the Corporation taking on responsibility for something that was not theirs. Whilst this was regarded as a good cause, Members felt that the project provided a luxury item for St Paul's and was not considered to be a sufficient responsibility to the City Corporation. Members requested more clarity, including the process for the potential S106 funding agreement and whether the City's capital investment should come from City's Fund when this was a private property, and were happy to put the bid on hold until this was provided.

It was agreed a fully thought-out plan with conditions was needed and Members agreed to give delegated authority to progress this work pending further information. Officers agreed to provide a report providing more detail and place the bid in a separate waiting room.

- **IT tech bids** - A Member observed that all tech funding bids were not capital bids. Officers confirmed this was an ongoing issue with IT being addressed by the TOM and required more investigative working. This would be changed later.
- **Hampstead Heath Pergola Oak Structures repair and replacement** – Members were informed that there were opportunities for fundraising at

this high-profile site and lots more that could be done including weddings. A Member requested that funding opportunities be revisited and that the City Corporation do more to support all fundraising opportunities and outreach.

RESOLVED, that Members: -

- Note the total value of City Fund and City's Cash bids amounting to £61.9m against a target upper limit of £30m (excl BHE);
- Review the initial RAG rating of £24.3m green, £29.3m amber and £8.4m red contained in the appendices (determined in consultation with senior officers);
- Agree that, subject to Member feedback, funding for the green bids be incorporated into the medium-term financial plans, providing they remain within the £30m overall limits for City Fund and City's Cash and remain at a similar modest level for Bridge House;
- Agree in principle that bids with a final RAG rating of amber and red be deferred;
- Agree that amber-rated bids be placed on a reserve list to be progressed in the event that funding headroom is identified;
- Note that the final decision on the green-rated bids for inclusion in the 2022/23 draft budgets will be confirmed at the joint meeting of RASC and the service committee and Bridge House Estates Board chairmen in January 2022;
- Agree that a minimal allocation to fund investigations to inform the central funding requirement for the St Paul's Gyratory is approved under delegated authority to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to ensure the process continues to progress;
- Agree that delegated authority be given to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to allow Officers to progress with work concerning St Paul's Cathedral Re-Lighting and explore options in more detail to present to Members whilst the bid is placed in a separate "waiting room".

7. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN BETWEEN MEETINGS

The Sub-Committee noted a report of the Town Clerk concerning action taken between meetings.

RESOLVED, that the report be noted.

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

There were no questions.

9. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT**
The Chair gave thanks to Karina Dostalova who stepped down as a Member of the Court of Common Council, and subsequently the Sub-Committee, after the publication of the agenda.
10. **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**
RESOLVED, that under Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following 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.
11. **NON-PUBLIC MINUTES**
RESOLVED, that the non-public minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 17 September 2021 were agreed as a correct record.
12. **ALLOCATION OF THREE INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS FUNDING WITHIN THE SCHOOLS FUNDING MODEL**
The Sub-Committee considered a joint report of the Director of Community & Children's Services and the Chamberlain regarding the Allocation of Three Independent Schools Funding within the Schools Funding Model.
13. **NON-PUBLIC REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN BETWEEN MEETINGS**
The Sub-Committee received a report of the Town Clerk regarding non-public action taken between meetings.
14. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE**
There were no non-public questions.
15. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE SUB-COMMITTEE AGREE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
There were no urgent items of non-public business.

The meeting ended at 3.42 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Leanne Murphy
Leanne.murphy@cityoflondon.gov.uk