

Budget Monitoring Statement

LOCAL RISK BUDGET Year to 31st March 2023	Final Approved Budget £000	2022/23 Actual Spend £000	Under / (Over) Spend £000	Note
City Fund				
City Fund Estate & Leadenhall	(2,080)	(1,886)	194	1
Walbrook Wharf	(1,072)	(1,026)	46	
Mayor's & City of London Court	(20)	(16)	4	
Central Criminal Court	(382)	(499)	(117)	2
Lower Thames St Roman Bath	(7)	(8)	(1)	
R&M & MI Work for other departments	(1,283)	(1,429)	(146)	3
Corporate FM cleaning & security	(97)	(111)	(14)	
	(4,941)	(4,975)	(34)	
City's Cash				
City's Estate	(2,582)	(2,340)	242	4
Departmental	(9,421)	(10,298)	(877)	5
Mayoralty & Shrievalty	(93)	(36)	57	
R&M & MI Work for other departments	(1,883)	(2,041)	(158)	6
Corporate FM cleaning & security	(626)	(687)	(61)	
	(14,605)	(15,402)	(797)	
Guildhall Administration				
Guildhall Complex	(9,329)	(9,067)	262	7
	(9,329)	(9,067)	262	
Total City Surveyor Local Risk excl BHE	(28,875)	(29,444)	(569)	
Bridge House Estates				
Bridge House Estates	(2,085)	(1,284)	801	8
Tower Bridge Corporate FM cleaning	(262)	(286)	(24)	
	(2,347)	(1,570)	777	
Total City Surveyor Local Risk incl BHE	(31,222)	(31,014)	208	

1. Savings principally on cyclical works, facilities management salaries, and professional fees. This was, in part, offset by a resulting reduction in service charges.
2. Overspend due to higher salary costs arising from agency cleaning staff and security overtime needed for events. Further significant energy price increases impacted this budget line.
3. There was an increase in one off reactive work across the portfolio as footfall rose as COVID-19 restrictions were lifted.
4. Savings principally due to reduction in the landlord's cyclical works programme to reflect planned disposals.
5. The overspend is mainly due to the residual Target Operating Model (TOM) and Fundamental Review (FR) savings target not being achieved or delayed. This includes £280k of cross cutting FR savings relating to centralisation of project and asset management which could not be achieved. They are planned to be

met from 2023/24 from savings achieved on the new Integrated Facilities Management contract.

6. There was an increase in one off reactive works across the portfolio due to higher footfall as COVID-19 restrictions were lifted, particularly on open spaces.
7. The underspend was primarily due to savings on water costs due to a rebate received, a reduced requirement in relation to clothing and uniform, on fees and services, and an energy rebate due to the Power Purchase Agreement.
8. The underspend was principally due to a saving on business rates. There were some significant business rate refunds achieved in respect of previous financial years, together with lower voids than anticipated, meaning the tenants picked up the anticipated rating costs rather than the City Corporation.
9. These figures exclude those savings, new income, and capital receipts generated for organisational budgets beyond City Surveyor's Department.