


<b>Efficiency and Performance Working Party</b>	 <b>CITY OF LONDON</b>
<b>Date:</b> Thursday 19 <sup>th</sup> April 2024	
<b>Time:</b> 11:30-13:00	
<b>Location:</b> Hybrid	
<b>Attendees:</b> Henry Colthurst; Caroline Al-Beyerty; Nick Bensted-Smith; Aaron D’Souza; Alice Reeves; Damian Nussbaum; Daniel O’Byrne; Dionne Corradine; Randall Anderson; Sonia Virdee; Michael Hudson; Genine Whitehorn; John McKinley; Beena Tanna	
<b>Apologies:</b>	

## Minutes

Item	
<b>1. Minutes and Apologies</b>	<p>There were no comments on the minutes of the last meeting.</p> <p>Ian Seaton’s apologies were noted.</p>
<b>2. Walbrook Wharf</b>	<p>It was noted that Walbrook Wharf is a joint project between Environment and City Surveyors. The commercial office space is run by the City surveyors, and the cleansing function, waste disposal etc are run by Environment.</p> <p>It was noted that there is a legal requirement to hold a wharf on the site and that Walbrook Wharf I protected in the local and London Plan</p> <p>Officers are working on a project to calculate the resources needed to perform the cleaning operation and how the market will perceive the support for the commercial use of the site. They will also address the questions that have been raised about the possible extension of river freight and the enlargement of the office block within this project.</p> <p>Planning has expressed concern about the vertical height of the Walbrook Wharf despite the height of the adjacent buildings. Planning has suggested the addition of one floor, but no more.</p> <p>A possible river freight at Walbrook Wharf was considered. Since the Wharf depends on the tide, it cannot be accessed all the time. A pier is needed to enable constant access. But, this will affect the environment and cost the City. Preliminary market research has indicated that companies do not want to build a pier and prefer to use a space that is already functional.</p> <p>It was noted that the Corporation is not in a position to fund the development of Walbrook Wharf.</p> <p>For the medium term, we need to examine the equipment that sustains the function of the wharf. Cory, who manages river waste, is responsible for the maintenance and upkeep. The contract with Cory ends in 2027. It was agreed to review the current expectations of Cory within the contract and explore the potential of a new contract with Cory.</p>

	<p>Officers are currently working on a long-term plan for the site, including a feasibility study to determine what is needed to maintain the Wharf's operation and an architectural study.</p> <p>It was observed that the essential investment assumption for Walbrook Wharf is funding from an external party. The potential move of the existing Environment Teams at the location will be considered if needed.</p> <p>It was noted that a report outlining the outcomes from the soft market testing and the medium-term requirements for the Wharf are intended to go to Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and Port Health and Environmental Services Committee. The paper would also include a long-term solution and one recommendation for the medium/long term instead of several options for the committees to approve.</p> <p>It was agreed that this working group would receive the paper to review and comment on prior to the submission to EASC/PHESC.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p><b>London Metropolitan Archives (LMA)</b></p> <p>It was noted that the LMA is re-branding to London Archives as it is the only archive in London which is specific to the history of London.</p> <p>It was agreed to undergo an options analysis, specifically reviewing third-party investment and relocation to already-owned City sites such as the new Museum location/Guildhall Library.</p> <p>It was noted that members preferred the hybrid approach to the LMA; this approach is to have a front-of-house based in the City with digital versions of the Archives and an off-site location which stores the archive. The potential affordability of this option was agreed to be explored.</p> <p>It was noted that 60% of the collection is statutory, and 40% is not statutory. It was discussed reviewing charging to store the 40%. It was approved to review the potential cost to City Bridge Foundation.</p> <p>The LMA is looking into ways of generating income, especially how it collaborates with the GLA, liveries, Church of England and financial institutions. It was reported that the LMA has received inquiries from organisations/other local authorities that want us to keep their archives for them because they lack the space on their own premises.</p> <p>It was agreed that officers would review what the archive currently holds and the space required to store the current archive. A review will also take place to understand what the archive can offer regarding storage for other authorities and organisations.</p> <p>The relocation of the archived could take 5-7 years, according to the report. The cost analysis of the relocation is ongoing, as the initial estimates were too broad.</p> <p>Members approved officer-level thinking and rejecting of options with the intention of a return in 3 months with a proposal.</p> <p>It was agreed that the feasibility study cost would come to the Finance Committee under Urgency in May</p>

	<p>One possible source of future income for the LMA is the National Lottery Heritage Fund, a large capital development fund which could support the creation of the storage market.</p>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>The Forward plan was discussed, and an additional meeting in May/June and November/October was agreed to reduce the agenda at the other meetings.</p> <p>A change in format for the forward plan was agreed to include rows specific to budget setting and the Resource Priorities Review.</p> <p>It was agreed to provide the previous minutes with the forward plan to Finance Committee.</p> <p>Members were asked to review the forward plan and suggest any additional items they felt were missed, or they would like to be reviewed by this Working group.</p>