

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE OF ALDERMEN
Tuesday, 6 December 2022

Minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen held at
Aldermen's Court Room, Mezzanine Floor, West Wing, Guildhall on Tuesday, 6
December 2022 at 10.30 am

Present

Members:

Alderman Sir William Russell (Chairman)
Alderman Sir Charles Bowman (Deputy Chairman)
The Rt. Hon. The Lord Mayor, Nicholas Lyons
Alderman Ian David Luder
Alderman Sir David Wootton
Alderman Sir Andrew Parmley
Alderman Sir Peter Estlin
Alderman Professor Michael Mainelli
Alderman Alison Gowman
Alderman Timothy Hailes
Alderman Robert Howard
Alderman and Sheriff Alastair King DL
Alderman Gregory Jones KC
Alderman Prem Goyal
Alderman Professor Emma Edhem
Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney
Alderwoman Susan Langley
Alderman Bronek Masojada
Alderman Alexander Barr
Alderman Christopher Makin
Alderman Tim Levene
Alderwoman Susan Pearson

Officers:

John Barradell	- Town Clerk and Chief Executive
Gemma Stokley	- Town Clerk's Department
Rhiannon Leary	- Executive Officer to the Court of Aldermen
Caroline Al-Beyerty	- The Chamberlain
Michael Cogher	- Comptroller and City Solicitor
Paul Double	- City Remembrancer
Caroline Jack	- Executive Director and Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Alderman Vincent Keaveny, Alderwoman Jennette Newman and Alderman Kawsar Zaman.

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

There were no declarations.

3. **MINUTES**

The Committee considered the minutes of the last meeting of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen held on 18 October 2022.

RESOLVED: - That the minutes of the last meeting of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen held on 18 October 2022 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

Chairman's Congratulatory Remarks

The Chairman wished to place on record his congratulations to Alderman Emma Edhem on having been invited and accepted to join Coexist House as a Trustee in the room of the late Sir Roger Gifford.

The Chairman encouraged all to continue to keep him informed of any new positions or accolades for noting at future meetings.

4. **FILM LIAISON OFFICER PRESENTATION**

The Chairman welcomed Joanna Burnaby-Atkins, the Corporation's Film Liaison Manager, and Mick Bagnall, the Film Liaison Officer to the meeting.

The Committee were informed that the Corporation's Film Liaison Unit was launched in 1998 and was currently a two-person team. It was reported that the City had a long history of supporting and investing in the film industry, including funding research into the fiscal benefits and the start-up of the London Film Commission, now known as 'Film London'. Officers added that the Town Clerk also sat on the Film London Executive Task Force.

Ms Burnaby-Atkins underlined that, previously, for a production to navigate permissions to carry out the things that they needed to do in the City was a long and laborious process with filming therefore often carried out illegally and haphazardly. The newly established film team in 1998 was established in order to provide a specialist, one-stop shop for filmmakers to relieve the pressure on other departments, to whittle down and refine requests and ensure that filming was always carried out safely. All of this was carried out with a primary focus on protecting the City's residents, workers and visitors and to protect the image of both the City Corporation and the Square Mile.

In supporting filming in the City, the Film Liaison Team were also supporting the UK filming industry and its many associated and supporting industries. It was reported that the UK was currently attaining record-breaking levels of film and High-End TV (HETV) production with spend on this in the UK in 2021 reaching over £5.7 billion – the highest figure since records began. Inward investment spend in the UK was £4.7 billion in 2021 (84% of UK total film and HETV spend and double the levels reached in 2020). The Aldermen were informed that film and HETV production was expected to grow at an average rate of over 7% per year between 2022 and 2025 reaching over £7 billion by 2025. 2021 had seen 790 filming days within the City with income generated into the City Corporation via the Film Team at just over £1.3 million – an increase of 275% over the past decade.

Ms Burnaby-Atkins went on to state that the most recent study that she had uncovered on tourism associated with filming came from a study in 2014 which stated that visitors to the UK spent nearly £600,000 in film-related tourism and £266 million in TV-related tourism. Conservative estimates suggested that seeing a film location on-screen accounts for 36% of visitors to the UK. Focusing on individual locations in London that were featured in films, the study found that between 43-56% of people who visited these locations did so because they had seen them on the big screen.

Officers went on to outline how they supported filming, underlining that it had been important to establish guidelines which had been drawn up in 2018. Under these, the Team supported filming that enhanced the reputation of the City of London, generated income for the City of London Corporation, contributed to a flourishing society and supported local communities and inspired enterprise, excellence, creativity and collaboration. Productions which could damage the reputation of the City, was disproportionately disruptive, required a disproportionate amount of time and commitment, disrupted the traffic network to a significant degree or undermined the City's corporate aim that people are safe and feel safe within the Square Mile were not supported/facilitated.

Mick Bagnall spoke on filming on the public highway, for which there were numerous requests within the City of London. It was reported that these varied in scale but that crews of only a maximum of 10 tended to be permitted during working days between 7am and 7pm. This meant that any filming of scale took place at weekends and occasionally on weekday evenings. Mr Bagnall underlined the importance of working collaboratively with all other City Corporation Departments on these matters but specifically the Highways Team and Environmental Health Team within the Highways Department as well as the City of London Police. The Team also liaised with external stakeholders such as TfL, the Metropolitan Police, the Civil Aviation Authority, the Port of London Authority and neighbouring boroughs where necessary. It was reported that location fees were not charged for filming on a public highway but that statutory fees were charged for things such as road closures, traffic control licences, hoarding licences and for both on-street and off-street parking. Income from these statutory charges for the last financial year for Highway and Parking costs accounted for just over half of the filming income raised by the film Team.

The Team also offered support to City businesses and landowners hosting filming such as Goldsmith's Hall, the Four Seasons Hotel, 20 Old Bailey, St. Bartholomew the Great Church and St Paul's Cathedral. Officers also took the opportunity to list a small number of larger shoots that had been filmed in the City in recent years including for Mission Impossible and James Bond films.

The Committee were informed that filming took place across a large number of diverse Corporation sites. It was noted that sites such as the Heathrow Animal Reception Centre and LMA were better suited to documentaries, with the Barbican walkways hosting a multitude of small fashion shoots. Other sites including Mansion House, the Old Bailey and Billingsgate Market had the

resource to host large TV dramas and features and were also utilised/in demand as facility bases for filming taking place nearby. Popular sites also included Tower Bridge, the City's Open Spaces, Leadenhall Market and St Dunstan's in the East.

It was recognised that demand was often higher than the Film Team could meet or had capacity for, and it was noted that many film shoots were declined due to short notice requests and so as not to impact heavily on City residents and businesses. It was underlined that filming requests were assessed carefully with those on the City's residential estates only coming forward in small numbers for example. These were then also subject to detailed consultation. When filming requests were received, the Film Team liaised with the relevant site, examined the script and synopsis, ensuring that anything controversial was cleared with the Executive Director of Communications. The Team went on to attend site visits and facilitated discussion between both sides to ensure progress. The Team was also responsible for negotiating and agreeing fees to ensure that these remained competitive. The Team ensured that risk assessments were provided as well as insurance, negotiating terms and conditions of contract and contract sign-off via the City's Comptroller's Department.

Going forward, filming levels look set to continue to increase. Officers reported that they had recently signed up to the London Location Library to allow those of the City Corporation's sites who wish to and had appropriate resource/capacity to promote themselves to be able to do so. It was reported that the Film Team were also now liaising with the team from Destination City to look at how filming could be used to promote the City. It was also reported that they were working on revising their Filming with Drones Policy given that many shoots now sought to use this technology.

In conclusion, Ms Burnaby-Atkins reported that she and Mr Bagnall have a combined experience over 45 years managing filming in the City Corporation and had, over this time, built up excellent relations with external organisations, internal departments and production location managers who brought in the films. The Film Team had contributed to pan-London working groups and seminars over the years to establish shared best practice across London and to create a Code of Ethics for the industry such as the Filmmakers Code of Conduct and a Safe Working Agreement that had enabled the Government to 'green-light' filming again after the pandemic. Officers underlined that they took great pride in seeing the City showcased on screen and welcomed any questions that the Committee might have.

An Alderman questioned who was responsible for liaising with neighbouring properties and others likely to be directly affected when road closures were approved for filming purposes. Officers reported that this involved liaising with the Environment Department and highlighted that any road closures were booked under a statutory process with a 12-week notice period. These closures were advertised, and the production companies also did letter drops on all neighbouring and surrounding properties in advance. For larger shoots, 3-4 letters were issued in the weeks preceding this.

Another Aldermen referred to two City locations being used within the most recent series of The Crown. However, he noted that the scene purported to be held in the Guildhall was filmed elsewhere and questioned whether this was due to particular sensitivities around using the actual Guildhall for this purpose. Officers responded to state that there had clearly been much controversy reported in the media around this series of The Crown and that a decision had therefore been taken to not permit filming for this out of respect for Her Majesty and the City Corporation's relationship with the Royal Family. The Alderman went on to question whether the Film Team were able to be increasingly proactive in their approaches to the industry. Officers reiterated that they had recently signed up to the London Location Library which, once live, would allow all London boroughs to promote their sites. The Film Team had been liaising internally with all Departments to let them know that they were able to promote their sites in this way using this resource.

An Alderman recognised that the film industry was one of the fastest growing industries in the UK and questioned whether the Film Team had a business plan in place that forecasts where future income generation might go given this growth. Officers reported that there were no current plans to increase the resource dedicated to this work within the City Corporation.

An Alderman questioned how far some of the City's environmental requirements were imposed upon those filming in the City in terms of the generators used for example. They went on to refer to Destination City and filming driving tourism. She referred specifically to one-time proposals around a Harry Potter Themed Unit in Leadenhall Market and questioned whether the Film Team would liaise with colleagues in these instances to help them understand and promote these kinds of drivers for tourism and engagement through Destination City. Officers reported that, whilst they were not aware of this specific proposal, they were in regular contact with the Destination City Team and had been discussing the inclusion of a Filming Map for the City on their website which was to be launched in March 2023. The map would provide details and background in terms of shoots that had taken place in the Square Mile. In terms of generator use, it was reported that there were huge moves taking place within the industry itself in relation to this and the environmental side of filming. It was highlighted that some companies had begun to make use of electrical generators and it was expected that this would be rolled out rapidly going forward.

An Alderman questioned how the Court might help in terms of promoting the City's offering. He also mentioned that he had come across productions taking place within his own Ward which he had had no prior knowledge of and therefore asked whether Ward Members could be included on future circulation lists alerting neighbours to these shoots. He went on to ask what the de minimis requirement was for notifying the Film Team of filming within the City and whether this extended to things such as interviews and documentaries. Officers underlined that every film team operating within the City were asked to submit an application to the Film Team. For those filming on a public street, there was, however, no legislation that stated that they *must* apply for permission in terms

of smaller crews doing 'vox pops' on the City's streets. However, they were obliged by law to have public liability insurance and to have carried out a risk assessment and so the request that they apply to the Film Team could often be helpful in terms of checking that this was in place.

An Alderman questioned what success might look like to the Team in the coming years – would this be a further increase in revenue or tourism for example? He also questioned how they were prioritising the number of requests being received. Officers reported that their key focus was to ensure that all filming carried out was done so safely without attracting complaints – this involved a huge amount of consultation, particularly around large shoots, and building effective working partnerships. They added that they were keen to achieve increased income not just for the City but also across London and the UK for this huge industry which employed a significant number of people. They underlined that they were also keen to see moves to make the industry increasing environmentally friendly. In response to a supplementary question, Officers stated that, with a continued increase in revenue, it was hoped that more resource may be dedicated to the Corporation's Film Team in due course to increase what it was possible to facilitate across the City's sites in terms of filming.

An Alderman spoke in terms of support for local communities and passing on some income to those areas where shoots took place such as the Golden Lane Estate and the HRA which she believed had happened in the past. Beyond financial support, she also questioned what kinds of opportunities there could be for local residents to become involved on shoots through various internships for example. The Alderman went on to refer to the amount of illegal filming which took place in the City, particularly for platforms such as YouTube and questioned what might be done to tackle this. Finally, she referred to drones used for filming purposes and issues with privacy. Officers responded to state that, at present, there was no formal mechanism for offering residents the opportunity to participate in a shoot but noted that there were various Film London initiatives and apprenticeship opportunities that could be flagged to them. Officers reported that they were aware with particular issues with illegal filming around the Golden Lane Estate garages which appeared to feature on various websites in terms of secret filming locations. Filming schools were given very clear guidelines who tended not to be the issue here. The Film Team had discussed the installation of cameras here with the Estate, but this had not been possible at the time, it was therefore a matter for security to monitor on site. Due to the sensitivities here, some filming requests had been turned down with just two productions taking place on the Golden Lane Estate in the last year, managed by a location team well known to the City Corporation and one who were well aware of the issues here. From these, a portion of the location fee had been segregated via the Estate Office. With regard to drones, the Committee were informed that the Civil Aviation Laws had changed towards the end of last year such that drones of 250g or under were now legally permitted to fly without permission. They did, however, require permission from the National Air Traffic System (NATS) as the City remained a restricted flight zone alongside Westminster and Canary Wharf. This required two weeks' notice and the Film Team continued to drive home the importance of liaising with them

when filming with drones so that checks could take place around their Civil Aviation Licence, their NATS permission, risk assessment and details of take-off and landing. At present, the Film Team only granted permission for take-off and landing of drones from public highway during the weekend. Current policy stated that road closures were necessary for any filming with drones but, because of the change in law, this would need to be amended.

Another Alderman questioned the City's charging policy for filming and whether this was purely reactive. He also questioned whether the Team liaised with other sites within the City such as Temple in terms of filming rates and referred any requests for filming that they were unable to accommodate to other, private venues within the Square Mile such as this. Officers reported that they did liaise with private sites both within and outside of the City in order to ensure that their fees remained competitive. It was reported that location and staff fees were top end, particularly for sites such as Mansion House and the Old Library and that demand was high. The Film Team also reported that they advised most of the City's sites on fee charging and that they were keen to reach out further here and build better working relations and share best practice. With specific reference to filming in Temple, it was reported that the Film Team did frequently offer support here in terms of things such as parking and logistics.

The Committee thanked the speakers for their contributions and congratulated them on all of their work to date.

5. **ALDERMANIC LIVERY LIAISON SCHEME**

The Chairman welcomed the Chairman of the Livery Committee, Philip Woodhouse to the meeting.

Mr Woodhouse spoke on the wider work undertaken in recent years to help lift the profile of the Livery Committee and improve communications both pan-Livery and with the City of London Corporation. He went on to speak of the opportunity which now arose to extend the liaison scheme operated by the Livery Committee to the Court of Aldermen. He underlined that he was not keen on being overly prescriptive in terms of the way in which and how often individual Aldermen and Livery Company Clerks might want to engage. He flagged that this was still very much a work in progress and opened up the proposal for wider discussion.

Alderman Gowman, who had also been involved in discussions on this proposal to date as Chair of the Magistracy and Livery Sub-Committee stated that this was a very valued scheme but had perhaps not been as successful as initially hoped. She was therefore very supportive of the idea of the Court of Aldermen now getting behind this as an effective means of engaging with the City's various Liveries and helping to make this as big a success as possible.

Another Alderman spoke in support of the proposal and questioned to what extent this Committee might act as a 'matchmaker' for those Liveries currently without an Alderman. The Chairman of the Livery Committee stated that he would welcome this role.

Other Aldermen also spoke in support of the proposal. All were encouraged to inform the Town Clerk of any amendments or additions to their list of Liveries presented today. The Deputy Chairman stated that, with this agreement in principle, the proposal would now be worked up in greater detail and would come back to this Committee at its next meeting.

An Alderman requested that details of sponsoring Aldermen of Livery Companies also be added to the list circulated going forward and that this be shared with the Committee going forward.

The Chairman queried whether Aldermen might be best assigned to those Livery Companies situated in their Wards where some links might already have been established.

Resolved – That the proposal be supported in principle with the Scheme now worked up in more detail and brought back to the next meeting of this Committee.

6. **ALDERMANIC APPOINTMENTS**

Resolved – That:

- a) Alderman Gregory Jones be appointed to the Magistracy and Livery Sub-Committee and
- b) Alderman Alison Gowman (Senior Alderman) and Alderman Kawsar Zaman (Junior Alderman) be appointed to the newly constituted Member Learning and Development Steering Group.

7. **DRAFT HIGH-LEVEL SUMMARY BUSINESS PLAN 2023/24 - MANSION HOUSE & OFFICE OF LORD MAYOR AND SHERIFFS**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director and Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor presenting the high-level summary Business Plan for the Mansion House & Office of Lord Mayor and Sheriffs for 2023/24.

The Executive Director and Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor reported that this set out the Department's main activity and direction of travel, broken down under

four headings – stabilise, commercialise, modernise and integrate better with other parts of the Corporation. She added that they were doing particularly well in terms of commercial activity which was a key part of the Target Operating Model (TOM) restructure made to generate the savings that were required here. She commented that she was very proud of the way in which the team had come together and were now moving in a new direction culturally.

An Alderman commented that the Operational Property and Projects Sub-Committee which he currently chaired had been looking at the bow wave issue and had taken the view that leaving this with relevant service committees to fix was not overly productive and so they had asked for a report on how to tackle the whole piece now be commissioned. This would look at the whole piece/project in terms of timetable and cost.

Another Alderman questioned how the KPIs could be made more quantitative as opposed to qualitative. He also questioned whether the finances might be presented more conventionally going forward. The Executive Director and Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor commented that she was seeking to make improvements in terms of both going forward and that what was presented here was a transitional arrangement. The Alderman suggested that the Department might consider something like Net Promoter Score in terms of quantitative data and measuring impact for both Mansion House and Lord Mayor and Sheriffs.

An Alderman noted that there was reference to the Climate Action Strategy within the report and questioned the drive towards the Mansion House building itself becoming net zero. She also questioned how the Central Criminal Court would work in terms of the Sheriffs and events going forward. The Executive Director and Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor clarified that the CCC now fell under the City Surveyor's remit. In terms of Mansion House and achieving net zero/the longer-term environmental goals, the Committee were informed that this site was also interdependent on the City Surveyor and Environment Department. The Alderman noted that it was therefore fair to say that the Mansion House may well not achieve net zero by 2027 in line with the corporate target.

The Committee thanked the Executive Director and Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor and her team for all of their hard work to date.

Resolved – That the Committee:

- i. Note the factors taken into consideration in compiling the Mansion House & Office of Lord Mayor and Sheriffs Business Plan; and
- ii. Approve, subject to the incorporation of any changes sought by this Committee, the departmental Business Plan 2023/24.

8. **OUTSTANDING ACTIONS LIST**

The Committee considered the Outstanding Actions List which had been updated since the last meeting on 18 October 2022.

Aldermanic Allowances – The Chairman reported that further information would be brought forward on this to the February meeting.

RESOLVED: - That –

- (i) the Outstanding Actions List be noted; and
- (ii) that completed items be removed from the list.

(III) **QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

There were no questions.

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

Note from the Crown Equerry re: Lord Mayor's Show Day

The Remembrancer reported that he had received a note from the Crown Equerry stating that they would be grateful to him if he could convey to the Lord

Mayor, Alderman and High Officers of the City of London for their generous acknowledgement of the contribution made by the Royal Mews staff on Lord Mayor's Show day following the gratuity payment made.

Herald's Proclamation Fee

The Remembrancer reported that there was an order from 1 March 1630 that stated that the Herald should be paid £5 collectively by the City following the Accession. Despite questioning whether the sum had increased with inflation, the Remembrancer clarified that he had been informed that it remained at £5. The Chairman suggested that this be negotiated such that a more generous payment of, say, £100 might be made.

Retirement of the Town Clerk and Chief Executive

Whilst it was recognised that a formal Vote of Thanks was to be moved at this afternoon's meeting of the Court of Aldermen, the Chairman wished to place on public record his great thanks to John Barradell at this, his last meeting of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen.

The Chairman thanked Mr Barradell for his ten years of service stating that the City Corporation was a unique, organisation; apart from the extent of its activities and the challenges they can produce, the absence of party politics and the existence of both the Court of Aldermen and of Common Council add to the complexity of how it runs. He commented that Mr Barradell's experience and ability enabled him very quickly to get a sense of the way in which the organisation works and that he had always shown a very quick grasp of issues key to the solving of problems. This had manifested itself in countless ways for this Court.

The Chairman concluded by stating that members of this Committee were therefore as one in expressing their warmest thanks to Mr Barradell and in wishing him, and his wife, a long and happy retirement, with many happy memories of Guildhall and of a job very well done.

11. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED - That, in accordance with the Court of Aldermen's Disclosure Arrangement (Standing Order 25), the public shall be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen have determined, having had due regard to the Disclosure Arrangement, that disclosure should not be permitted.

12. NON-PUBLIC MINUTES

The Committee considered the non-public minutes of the last meeting of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen held on 18th October 2022 and approved them as a correct record.

13. MINUTES OF THE EMANUEL HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee received the minutes of the Emanuel Hospital Management Sub-Committee meeting held on 19th October 2022.

14. **MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE OF ALDERMEN TO ADMINISTER THE SIR WILLIAM COXEN TRUST FUND**
The Committee received the minutes of the Committee of Aldermen to administer the Sir William Coxen Trust Fund meeting held on 11th October 2022.
15. **MINUTES OF THE MAGISTRACY AND LIVERY SUB-COMMITTEE**
The Committee received the minutes of the Magistracy and Livery Sub-Committee meeting held on 20th October 2022.
16. **FINANCE UPDATE ON THE MANAGEMENT FOR THE EMANUEL HOSPITAL (CHARITY REGISTRATION NUMBER 206952)**
The Committee considered and approved a report of the BHE & Charities Finance Director (representing the Chamberlain) setting out the Emanuel Hospital Charity's financial position as at the most recent year end (2021/22) and in the period to date (6 months to 30 September 2022), with a forecast for the remainder of the 2022/23 financial year alongside a cash flow forecast for 2022/23 and 2023/24.
17. **MANSION HOUSE (& CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT)- INCOME GENERATION 2021 - 22 & CHARGES 2023 - 24**
The Committee considered and approved a report of the Executive Director, Mansion House reviewing income generation in the 2021-22 Financial Year, providing a brief update on the implementation of Mansion House's new commercial strategy and recommending the future rates to be agreed for the 2023-24 Financial Year as well as highlighting other relevant issues.
18. **UPDATE REPORT - STRATEGY GROUP THREE - COMMUNICATIONS AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**
Aldermanic Strategy Group Three – Communications and Stakeholder Engagement took the opportunity to update the Committee on the progress of their various workstreams.
19. **APPOINTMENT OF NEW HONORARY COMMON CRYER AND SERJEANT AT ARMS**
The Committee considered and approved the appointment of a new Honorary Common Cryer and Serjeant at Arms.
20. **NON-PUBLIC QUESTIONS ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**
There were no questions.
21. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIRMAN CONSIDERS URGENT AND WHICH THE COMMITTEE AGREES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHILST THE PUBLIC ARE EXCLUDED**
The Committee considered the awarding of the Livery Cloth Grant and discussed the appointment of the Deputy Serjeant at Arms as well as access to non-public papers of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen.
22. **CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES**

The Committee considered and approved the confidential minutes of the last meeting of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen held on 18th October 2022.

The meeting ended at 12.03 pm

Chairman

Contact Officer: Gemma Stokley
gemma.stokley@cityoflondon.gov.uk