

## City of London Corporation Committee Report

<b>Committee(s):</b> Capital Buildings Board – For approval	<b>Dated:</b> 24/02/2026
<b>Subject:</b> Future Police Estate Programme (inclusive of Salisbury Square Development) Governance and Delegated Authority	<b>Public report:</b> For Decision
<b>This proposal:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>delivers Corporate Plan 2024-29 outcomes.</b></li> <li>• <b>provides statutory duties.</b></li> <li>• <b>provides business enabling functions</b></li> </ul>	Diverse Engaged Communities, Vibrant Thriving Destination, Dynamic Economic Growth, Leading Sustainable Environment
<b>Does this proposal require extra revenue and/or capital spending?</b>	No
<b>If so, how much?</b>	
<b>What is the source of Funding?</b>	
<b>Has this Funding Source been agreed with the Chamberlain’s Department?</b>	
<b>Report of:</b>	Paul Wilkinson, City Surveyor
<b>Report author:</b>	Genine Whitehorne, CCPD Director

## Summary

This report proposes the establishment of a Delegated Authority arrangement to support the successful delivery of the Future Police Estate Programme (FPEP), including the Salisbury Square Development (SSD) Programme.

Following the approval of a total budget of £750.2m (excl. Optimism Bias) by the Court of Common Council (CoCo) in March 2025 (as outlined in Appendix 2), the Programme has now entered a critical phase of delivery. The SSD Programme has recently reached its “topping out” milestone, while other ancillary FPEP projects are progressing into critical delivery stages.

To minimise financial, operational, and reputational risks, and to ensure the continued

successful delivery of the FPEP (incl. SSD), a rigorous and agile governance framework is required, one that can support the fast-paced nature of the portfolio.

This paper sets out two options:

1. **Do Nothing** – retaining the current governance structure, whereby full financial and contractual authority sits with the Capital Buildings Board (CBB), with no de-minimis threshold; or
2. **Delegated Authority** – establishing a Delegated Authority for the Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) of the FPEP (incl. SSD).

Under the proposed Delegated Authority model, the CBB would continue to oversee drawdowns, expenditure, procurement, scope, and overall Programme progress. However, decisions with a value of up to £2m would be taken outside of the CBB, by the SRO, to enable timely and efficient programme delivery. All such decisions would be reported to the next available meeting of the CBB. Decisions taken under the Delegated Authority would be capped at £2m within the agreed programme envelope and would expressly exclude Optimism Bias, which currently stands at £28.7m remaining of the original £30m. All decisions relating to drawdown from the Optimism Bias would continue to be submitted to the CBB for decision, with no de-minimis threshold.

## Recommendation

That the SRO of FPEP (incl. SSD) is granted authority to make decisions with a cost implication of up to £2m, noting that the City Surveyor already holds signatory authority of up to £15m, for the approval and signature of contracts only (in consultation with the Commercial Director), as detailed in the tables below.

## Main Report

### Background

Delivery of major capital programmes within the City of London has historically been managed through varying governance arrangements. For programmes exceeding £100m, Member oversight has been provided by the Capital Buildings Board (CBB), which holds full delegated authority for drawdowns of budget against agreed funding envelopes and monitoring and approval of expenditure against those budgets. At Officer level, individual Programme Boards report into the Chamberlain's Project Assurance Board and, where required, the Town Clerk's Portfolio Board.

Following the introduction of the P3 Policy framework, governance for programmes at all tiers has been reviewed. A notable example is the Barbican Renewal Programme (BRP), which, under bespoke governance approved by the Policy & Resources Committee in July 2025, established Joint SRO Delegated Authority of up to £5m within a £231m envelope. This paper proposes a similar but proportionate approach for the FPEP (incl. SSD), recommending a Delegated Authority of £2m within the £750.2m envelope (excl. Optimism Bias) agreed by CoCo.

## Current Position

Historically, delegated authority for project delivery was limited to £1m for programmes under £100m, and this arrangement was never formally extended to major programmes. As a result, SROs for large, complex programmes were unable to take timely decisions outside committee cycles, leading to bottlenecks, delays, and inefficiencies.

The recently approved P3 governance framework has modernised and formalised delegated authority and governance processes for Tier 1–3 projects (those below £100m). However, these improvements do not yet extend to Tier 4 (Major) Programmes, leaving a persistent gap in decision-making agility at the highest programme tier.

In response to this gap, some Tier 4 programmes, most notably the Barbican Renewal Programme (BRP), have implemented bespoke governance arrangements. The BRP's introduction of a £5m delegated authority for its Joint SROs has demonstrated clear benefits: faster decision-making, improved cost control, and avoidance of programme delays.

FPEP, particularly SSD as it moves into its final 12 months of delivery, is operating at a similar, exceptionally fast pace, where time-critical commercial decisions are frequently required. Decisions below £2m are typically operational and time critical, requiring rapid resolution to avoid delays. Allowing the SRO to act at this level ensures the programme can adapt quickly to emerging issues, maintain momentum, and respond effectively to critical escalation matters.

Major/Tier 4 Programmes automatically report to the Capital Buildings Board (CBB), which has played a central role in supporting FPEP (incl. SSD) to date. However, CBB currently holds full delegated authority with no de-minimis threshold, meaning even low-level operational matters must be escalated, slowing progress in a delivery environment that often requires rapid commercial responses.

Granting the SRO a delegated authority of up to £2m would align FPEP (incl. SSD) with modernised governance practice observed elsewhere in the organisation. As these programmes are funded from public monies, governance must balance robust scrutiny with sufficient agility. Enhancing SRO delegated authority supports this balance by maintaining oversight where appropriate while ensuring efficient delivery, effective resource management, and value for money across both programmes.

## Options and Proposal

- **OPTION A:** Do Nothing. Retain the existing governance model, with no delegated authority for the SRO. This would continue current challenges, including delayed decisions and potential cost escalation due to the pace and complexity of the programmes.
- **OPTION B – RECOMMENDED:** Grant Delegated Authority of up to £2m to the SRO for FPEP (incl. SSD), excluding Optimism Bias. This threshold is aligned with operational decision requirements while ensuring matters of higher strategic significance remain within Member oversight. It is also proportionate given the current stage of delivery and that a substantial portion of the £750.2m envelope has already been drawn down via CBB.

All decisions taken under this delegation would be reported to the relevant committees and Programme Boards, logged, tracked, and subject to appropriate procurement processes. Higher value contracts would continue to follow full procurement and committee approval routes. An overview of officer governance arrangements, as well as a table of responsibilities, is set out in Appendix 1.

### **Summary of Delegated authority and Member governance arrangements**

The table below sets out which of the above responsibilities are proposed for delegation to the SRO. This applies only to funds within the approved envelope £750.2m, excluding Optimism Bias.

<b>Action / Stage</b>	<b>&lt;£2m</b>	<b>&gt;£2m–£15m</b>	<b>&gt;£15m</b>
<b>Drawdown of funds</b>	SRO	CBB	CBB
<b>Approval of procurement strategy report (pre-procurement)</b>	SRO	CBB	CBB
<b>Approval of procurement award report (award of contracts)</b>	SRO	SRO	CBB
<b>Contract extensions/variatio ns (new contract value)</b>	SRO	CBB	CBB
<b>Signature of contract</b>	SRO	SRO (part of City Surveyor current responsibilities)	With Comptroller's
<b>Approval of Purchase Orders</b>	SRO	SRO	With Comptroller's

## **Corporate & Strategic Implications**

Strategic Implications: FPEP (incl. SSD) delivers against all six of the CoLC's strategic aims, so any action that supports efficient and effective delivery of its benefits directly supports the Corporate Plan. Prompt and well-informed decision making will help accelerate progress towards a more equitable, resilient and successful site (Diverse Engaged Communities, Vibrant Thriving Destination, Dynamic Economic Growth) and achievement of the City's net zero targets (Leading Sustainable Environment).

Financial implications: none

Resource implications: Improved Efficiency. It is anticipated that more agile governance would decrease the amount of time officers spend writing papers for approval and would ultimately improve operational efficiency.

Legal implications: none

Risk implications: Reduced risk of programme delays and additional cost. Reduced risk of disconnect between capital programme and operations/business plan.

Equalities implications: none

Climate implications: supports efficient delivery of CoLC's net zero targets.

Security implications: none

## **Conclusion**

For the reasons outlined above, Members are asked to endorse and approve the recommendations made above regarding governance and revised delegated authority of the FPEP (incl. SSD).

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1 – Table of Responsibilities and Officers' Governance

Appendix 2 – Asset Breakdown of £780.2m (incl. Optimism Bias) as approved at Court of Common Council in March 2025.

## **Background Papers**

none

**Genine Whitehorne**

CCPD Director

E: [genine.whitehorne@cityoflondon.gov.uk](mailto:genine.whitehorne@cityoflondon.gov.uk)

## Appendix 1 – Table of Responsibilities and Officers' Governance

	<b><i>Delegation to SRO</i></b>	<b><i>CBB</i></b>	<b><i>Reserved to P&amp;R or other relevant committees</i></b>
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Day-to-day ownership of the Programme Plan and approved milestones</li> <li>• Appointment of resources in support of the delivery of the programme (including professional services in line with B below)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of the Programme Plan and milestones</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noting approval of the Programme Plan and milestones quarterly</li> </ul>
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of programme budget</li> <li>• Release of monies at approved milestones in the project plan, up to £2m</li> <li>• Award of contracts up to up to £2m (noting that one of the SROs holds current authorised signature limit of £15m).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBB to receive regular budget monitoring reports.</li> <li>• Variances of &gt;15% must be reported to CBB and approval sought.</li> <li>• Award of contracts over the level allowed under Officer Delegation threshold.</li> <li>• Noting quarterly updates on the budget and spent.</li> <li>• Review of anything beyond the envelope approved at COCO in March 2025.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noting quarterly updates on the budget and spent.</li> <li>• Approval of anything beyond the current agreed envelope approved, with subsequent approval at Court of Common Council.</li> </ul>
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of progress against programme plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exception reporting of key risks and issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decisions beyond the pre- approved changes in strategy and policy of the programme.</li> </ul>

## **Officer governance**

At officer level FPEP (incl. SSD) Programme Board has been operating since the Programme started. The primary aim of this board is to provide strategic oversight and coordination for all aspects of the Programmes. This includes managing risks, addressing dependencies between projects, and ensuring robust financial oversight of the associated budgets. The Board will oversee the top-level communication and engagement strategy across all related projects. This Board also plays a key role in coordinating reports to Capital Buildings Board, Policy and Resource committee, and Chamberlain's Assurance Board, with other relevant officer boards.

It is chaired by the SRO and attended by all key project and design team members as well as representatives from Chamberlains and the EPMO.

In line with current internal officers' processes, the Programme informs the Chamberlain's Assurance Board; the primary aim of which is to provide strategic financial oversight and coordination for all financial, contractual, and procurement matters related to the approved Major Programmes/Tier 4.

**Appendix 2 – Asset Breakdown of £780.2m (incl. Optimism Bias) as approved at Court of Common Council in March 2025.**

<b>Asset</b>	<b>Budget (£m)</b>
Salisbury Square	631.5
Bastion House / Decant Allowance	2.1
Bishopsgate	0.2
Discreet Offsite Facility	2.1
Eastern Base	34.2
Fit Out / Cat C / General	9.8
Guildhall Yard East	22.8
IT	14.7
Mounted Unit (Option 1)	4.3
Property Store	3.7
TFTF	24.8
<b>Total Portfolio</b>	<b>750.2</b>
Optimism Bias	30.0
<b>Total Portfolio Sum</b>	<b>780.2</b>