



House of Commons
Regulatory Reform Committee

**Proposal for the
Regulatory Reform
(Museum of London)
(Location of Premises)
Order 2004**

Fourth Report of Session 2003–04



House of Commons
Regulatory Reform Committee

**Proposal for the
Regulatory Reform
(Museum of London)
(Location of Premises)
Order 2004**

Fourth Report of Session 2003–04

*Report, together with formal minutes and
written evidence*

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 3rd March 2004*

The Regulatory Reform Committee

The Regulatory Reform Committee is appointed to consider and report to the House of Commons on proposals for regulatory reform orders under the Regulatory Reform Act 2001 and, subsequently, any ensuing draft regulatory reform order. It will also consider any "subordinate provisions order" made under the same Act.

Current membership

Mr Peter Pike (*Labour, Burnley*) (Chairman)
Mr Russell Brown (*Labour, Dumfries*)
Brian Cotter (*Liberal Democrat, Weston-super-Mare*)
Mr Jeffrey M. Donaldson (*Democratic Unionist, Lagan Valley*)
Mr Dai Havard (*Labour, Merthyr Tydfil and Rhymney*)
Andy King (*Labour, Rugby and Kenilworth*)
Mr Mark Lazarowicz (*Labour, Edinburgh North and Leith*)
Mr Andrew Love (*Labour/Co-operative, Edmonton*)
Mr John MacDougall (*Labour, Central Fife*)
Chris Mole (*Labour, Ipswich*)
Mr Denis Murphy (*Labour, Wansbeck*)
Dr Doug Naysmith (*Labour/Co-operative, Bristol North West*)
Mr Archie Norman (*Conservative, Tunbridge Wells*)
Andrew Rosindell (*Conservative, Romford*)
Mr Anthony Steen (*Conservative, Totnes*)
Brian White (*Labour, Milton Keynes North East*)

Powers

The full constitution and powers of the Committee are set out in House of Commons Standing Order No. 141, available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/regulatory_reform_committee.cfm.

A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Parliament is at the back of this volume.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Martyn Atkins (Clerk), Stuart Deacon (Committee Specialist), Brian Dye (Committee Assistant) and Liz Booth (Secretary).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Regulatory Reform Committee, Committee Office, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 2837; the Committee's email address is regrefcom@parliament.uk.

Contents

Report	<i>Page</i>
Summary	3
1 Report under Standing Order No. 141	5
2 Introduction	5
3 Purpose of the proposal	5
Background to the proposal	6
4 Extent of the proposal's application	7
5 Assessment of the proposal against the Standing Order No. 141(6) criteria	8
Inappropriate use of delegated legislation	8
Removal of burdens	8
The new burden	8
Proportionality of the new burden	8
Continuation of necessary protection	8
Fair balance and the desirability of the proposal	9
Analysis of costs and savings	10
Benefits other than savings	12
Adequate consultation	12
6 Conclusion	13
Formal minutes	14
Written evidence	15
Reports from the Regulatory Reform Committee since 2001	<i>inside back cover</i>

Summary

The purpose of the proposal is to permit the Museum of London to operate a museum anywhere within the confines of Greater London, rather than within the limits of the City of London as the current law requires. The intention behind the proposed change is to allow the Museum of London to merge with the Museum in Docklands, which is situated in the Docklands area of London at West India Quay.

The Committee considers that the proposal is straightforward and beneficial and it recommends that a draft order in the same form as the proposal be laid before the House.

1 Report under Standing Order No. 141

1. The Regulatory Reform Committee has examined the proposal for a Regulatory Reform (Museum of London) (Location of Premises) Order 2004 in accordance with Standing Order No. 141. On the evidence before us, we are content that a draft order in the same terms as the proposal should be laid before the House. Some 29 days of the period for Parliamentary consideration still remain, during which we may yet receive further representations. We will therefore make our formal recommendation to the House later in the 60 day period. Meanwhile, our report on the evidence is set out below.

2 Introduction

2. On 22 January 2004 the Government laid before Parliament a proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Museum of London) (Location of Premises) Order 2004 in the form of a draft of an order and an explanatory memorandum from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (the Department).¹ The proposed regulatory reform order would amend the Museum of London Act 1965 to expand the geographical limit within which the Museum of London would be permitted to operate a museum. That limit is currently set at the boundary of the City of London; under the proposal the revised boundary would encompass the whole of Greater London.

3. The House has instructed us to examine the overall proposal against the criteria specified in Standing Order No. 141(6) and then, in the light of that examination, to report whether the Government should proceed, whether amendments should be made, or whether the order should not be made.²

4. Our discussion of matters arising from our examination is set out below. Where a criterion specified in Standing Order No. 141(6) is not discussed in the report, this indicates that we have no points to raise about that criterion. In the course of our examination, we requested further information from the Department about a number of issues relating to the proposal. The Department's response is reproduced as Appendix B.

3 Purpose of the proposal

5. The purpose of the proposal is to increase the geographical limits within which the Museum of London is permitted to operate, thus making it legally possible for the Museum of London to merge with the Museum in Docklands, which is situated outside the current limit for the Museum of London's operation.

1 Copies of the proposal are available to Members of Parliament from the Vote Office and to members of the public from the Department. The proposal is also available on the Cabinet Office website: <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/regulation/act/proposals.htm>

2 Standing Order No. 141(2)

Background to the proposal

6. The Museum of London was established by the Museum of London Act 1965 (the 1965 Act), which had the effect of merging two existing museums, the London Museum and the Guildhall Museum, defining the functions of the new museum and appointing a Board of Governors to manage it and hold its property.

7. The 1965 Act required the Board to acquire premises situated in the City of London for the purposes of maintaining and exhibiting their collections and subsequently to keep their collections at those premises. The Act does, however, permit the Board to store or exhibit objects in their collections at other places, that is, other than at their own premises, including premises outside the confines of the City of London. The effect of the 1965 Act has therefore been to allow the Museum of London to make items in its collections available for exhibition by other institutions, at locations outside the City of London, but the Museum may not itself acquire any exhibition facility which is outside the geographical limit imposed by the Act.

8. Parliament's intention in passing the Museum of London Act 1986 (the 1986 Act) was, among other things, to amend the constitution of the Museum's Board of Governors in the light of the abolition of the Greater London Council. Of the six members of the Board who had, prior to the 1986 Act, been appointed by the Greater London Council, three are now appointed by the Prime Minister and three by the Corporation of the City of London. The Prime Minister and the Corporation both now appoint nine members each.

9. The 1986 Act also introduced a more explicit definition of the functions of the Museum's Board of Governors, providing that the Board was required to:

- care for, preserve and add to the objects in their collections;
- secure that those objects are exhibited to the public and made available to persons wishing to inspect them in connection with study or research; and
- generally to promote understanding and appreciation of historic and contemporary London and of its society and culture, both by means of their collections and by such other means as they consider appropriate.

10. The Department have explained that the Museum of London began assembling material specifically relating to the port of London and Docklands areas in the early 1980s, as a response to the closure of the London docks.³ The result has been a 'Port and Docklands' collection which is regarded as an integral part of the Museum of London's 20th century collections. It was the collection of this material which led to proposals for a new museum in the Docklands which would focus on the history of the area, of commerce on the Thames and the people who were involved in shipping.

11. The Department refers to the substance of evidence submitted in 1981 by the Board of the Museum of London to the then House of Commons Education, Science and Arts Committee. In its evidence the Board indicated that it had resolved to seek opportunities to develop new display space for exhibitions on London's maritime and industrial past and

they preferred that these new facilities should themselves be situated within the Docklands area. In their Annual Report for 1981/82, the Board indicated their intention to establish a trust to take forward the development of a separate Docklands Museum.⁴ In order to develop the Museum the Board would seek to identify a suitable developer who would provide the ‘shell’ and ‘core’ for the new facility; the remaining building and fitting out costs would need to be met by the London Docklands Development Corporation, and a Museum in Docklands Trust would need to be established to raise the necessary exhibition and equipment costs. The Board estimated that it would cost £15 million to establish the new Museum.⁵

12. The Department record that the Museum of London’s plan was made feasible in 1997 when the Heritage Lottery Fund (the Fund) approved a grant for £11.8 million to fund capital works for the project. Other contributors also agreed to make grants in support of the project, including the London Docklands Development Corporation which made a grant of £3.14 million.

13. From June 2000, during the course of the development of the Museum in Docklands, the Fund began to be concerned about the way in which the project was being approached by the Museum’s Trustees and in particular about their assumptions concerning likely visitor numbers.⁶ The Fund considered that the Trustees had failed to take adequate account in their business plan of the way in which market conditions were changing for operators of Museums after the national museums were opened to the public free of charge. In the course of 2001 delays in building work began to give rise to additional development costs. The Department have indicated that the Fund came to the conclusion that the new Museum would require “the operational strength of the Museum of London and its ability to lever in additional funding” in order for it to be successful.⁷ The Fund furthermore felt that support costs could be reduced if the two organisations were merged and in April 2002 it made a merger a condition of its future support for the Museum in Docklands. The governing bodies of both Museums formally approved plans to seek a merger at meetings in March 2003.⁸

14. The Museum in Docklands was opened to the public on 24 May 2003.

4 Extent of the proposal’s application

15. The proposal has application only within England.

4 Explanatory statement, p 4

5 Explanatory statement, p 4

6 Appendix B

7 Explanatory statement, p 4

8 Explanatory statement, p 4

5 Assessment of the proposal against the Standing Order No. 141(6) criteria

Inappropriate use of delegated legislation

16. **The proposal appears to be appropriate for delegated legislation.**

Removal of burdens

17. The Department have stated that the proposal would remove the burden imposed by section 4(1) and (2) of the Museum of London Act 1965, which limits the power of the Board of Governors of the Museum of London to acquire premises for the purposes of maintaining and exhibiting their collections to premises situated in the City of London. **The Committee agrees.**

The new burden

18. The proposal would also impose a new burden on the Museum of London by once again restricting its power to acquire premises for the purposes of maintaining and exhibiting its collections, although the new restriction would limit the power to premises situated within Greater London. The effect is to increase the sphere of the Museum's direct operations from the City of London to the whole of Greater London. The new burden is therefore equally as restrictive in kind, but less restrictive in its application, than that which the proposal would remove.

Proportionality of the new burden

19. The Department have argued that the new geographical restriction is proportionate to the benefit which this would make possible, namely a merger between the Museum of London and the Museum in Docklands and the likely removal of the threat that the Museum in Docklands would be closed. These benefits, however, would be expected to flow from the removal of the existing burden rather than the creation of the proposed new burden. The requirement of the Regulatory Reform Act is that the making of any new provision which imposes a burden is proportionate to the benefit which is expected to result from its creation. In this instance the question is therefore whether restricting the Museum of London's operations to Greater London will be proportionate to the benefits that are expected to result from that restriction. **We consider that the new burden constituted by the enlarged restriction satisfies the test of proportionality.**

Continuation of necessary protection

20. The Department believe that the proposal would not remove any protection. It has argued that confining the operation of the Museum of London to Greater London will afford a continuing measure of protection in respect of its role as a public facility for the understanding and appreciation of historic and contemporary London, although it is not

made explicit in whose interest that form of protection would be continued.⁹ It is noted that the original geographical restriction to the confines of the City of London was felt to be appropriate at the time of the foundation of the Museum of London for the reason that the Guildhall Museum, which was one of the Museum of London's two precursors, had been situated there. The Department has not offered any explicit assessment as to whether there is any value now in this restriction to the City and it does not comment on whether there is any element of protection in it.

21. We note that the Museum of London Act 1965 (as amended by the Museum of London Act 1986) provides that the Museum “may not acquire or dispose of any land or estate or interest in land without the consent of the Secretary of State and the Corporation [of the City of London]”.¹⁰

22. We also note that the interests of the City of London continue to be strongly represented in the management of the Museum, in that the Corporation of the City of London appoints half of the members of the Museum's Board of Governors.

23. It does not seem to us necessary for a museum established “to promote understanding and appreciation of historic and contemporary London” to be located only within the City of London. In view of the on-going requirements of the extant legislation to which we refer above, we are satisfied that the interests of the City of London in the Museum of London continue to be adequately protected.

24. We nevertheless note that, under the proposal, the Museum of London would gain a new power in law to acquire premises for the purposes of maintaining and exhibiting its collections anywhere within Greater London. This gives rise to the possibility that the Museum could in future take over other museums in Greater London, or locate its own exhibition facilities anywhere within that much wider area, subject to the prescribed consents, the purposes of any museum so acquired being compatible with the Museum of London Acts and, of course, the availability of the finance which would be required. Although there is no indication in the explanatory statement that the Museum of London has any intention of exercising the power in this manner, we draw these possibilities to the attention of the House.

25. We consider that the proposal does not remove any necessary protection.

Fair balance and the desirability of the proposal

26. The Department have argued that the proposal satisfies the test of desirability in that it reduces the restrictiveness, and thus the burden inherent in, the current provision. **We agree.**

27. The Department has specified the benefits which it expects to arise from the amendment of the geographical restriction, these being:

⁹ Explanatory statement, p 5

¹⁰ Museum of London Act 1965, section 3(4) (as amended by the Museum of London Act 1986, section 2(1))

- i. the removal of the legal impediment to the full institutional merger of the Museum of London and the Museum in Docklands, with forecast cost savings¹¹ which would accrue to the new combined museum; and,
- ii. consequentially, a secured future for the present Museum in Docklands exhibition at West India Quay, which the Department believes might otherwise need to close as a consequence of the withdrawal of support by its financial sponsors.

28. On this basis the Committee is satisfied that the proposal strikes a fair balance between the public interest, which lies in the progress of the intended merger of the two museums, and the interests of the Museum of London, which would henceforward be restricted to operating museums only within Greater London.

Analysis of costs and savings

29. The Department states that, having become aware of financial difficulties with the project to establish the Museum in Docklands, the Heritage Lottery Fund came to the conclusion that the project had no prospect of long-term success, operationally or in financial terms, without its absorption into the Museum of London, with the increased resources and reduced costs from which that merger would allow the combined museum to benefit.

30. We have understood from additional information supplied by the Department at our request that the Heritage Lottery Fund first began to be concerned about the direction of the Museum in Docklands project from June 2000. There were three connected and consequential reasons why they began to re-evaluate the basis on which they could continue to provide it with financial support¹². We have been informed that the reasons for their concern were that:

- a) the Trustees of the Museum in Docklands continued to be unable to secure third-party funding to support the operation of the Museum in the long term;
- b) as a consequence of this it had to be doubted whether the business plan for the Museum in Docklands would be viable – in particular, it was felt that the Trustees continued to make unrealistic assumptions about future visitor numbers whilst failing to make adequate plans for marketing the Museum in Docklands actively as a visitor attraction; and
- c) in the light of the considerations referred to above, there was cause to question whether the then management arrangements for the Museum in Docklands would be adequate to deliver a successful museum enterprise.

These concerns are described as having developed against a background of changed ‘market conditions’ for museum operators consequent upon the opening of national museums to the public without charge¹³. It appears from correspondence which we have had with the Department that the Trustees may have failed to make realistic plans in part

11 Explanatory Statement, pp 7 and 8

12 Appendix B

13 Explanatory statement, p 4

because they believed, until as late as April 2002, that an anonymous donor would offset the pressure of these more difficult market conditions by providing a permanent endowment of £5 million which would support the running costs of the Docklands Museum. The Department indicates that the donation was not forthcoming.¹⁴

31. The Department has informed us that it was mutually agreed in April 2002 by the Heritage Lottery Fund and the Museum in Docklands that the only way for the Museum in Docklands to continue in operation would be for it to be merged into the Museum of London, with the economies of scale and enhanced managerial resources this would introduce.¹⁵ On the condition that the merger would take place at the earliest opportunity, the Fund agreed to provide further funding for the pre-opening period and for the first three years of the operating life of the Museum in Docklands. We understand that the grants from the Fund provided on this basis comprise 100% of the Museum in Docklands' capital budget for the current financial year 2003/04 (amounting to £808,000) and nearly 31% of the forecast revenue budget for the first three years of the Museum's operation (comprising grants totalling £1.02 million)¹⁶. We therefore assume that these resources would indeed be lost to the project should the two Museums be unable to merge.

32. The Department have indicated that substantial savings could also be made on present running expenses of the current museums by the implementation of the proposal. These are of the nature of economies of scale in the form of reduced staffing costs and the avoidance of the expense of maintaining two separate charitable companies for the two existing museums (with the attendant audit and Board secretarial costs). These costs are forecast by the Department to amount to around £1 million over the first three years of the operating life of the Museum in Docklands.¹⁷ It has been further indicated that, in the event of the closure of the Museum in Docklands, further recurrent costs of the order of £150,000 per annum would be expected to arise in connection with the maintenance and storage of the materials owned by the Museum of London presently exhibited by the Museum in Docklands, which would in this eventuality need to be accommodated at an appropriate storage facility.¹⁸

33. The Department also consider that, in the event that the Museum in Docklands were forced into closure by a failure to merge,¹⁹ this would represent the waste of £11.8 million previously invested in the project by way of a capital grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund.²⁰ One respondent to the Department's consultation exercise also noted that £3.14 million granted to the Museum in Docklands by the London Docklands Development Corporation would similarly prove to have been wasted should the Museum in Docklands fail.

14 Appendix B

15 Explanatory statement, p 4 and Appendix B

16 Appendix B

17 Explanatory statement, p 7

18 Explanatory statement, p 8

19 Explanatory statement, Annex D, p 16

20 Explanatory statement, p 4

34. On the basis of the Regulatory Impact Assessment and additional evidence provided to us by the Department, we are satisfied that the proposal has been the subject of, and taken appropriate account of, estimates of increases or reductions in costs which may result from the implementation of this proposal.

Benefits other than savings

35. The Department have noted that any increase in visitor and tourist activity in the Docklands area may be expected to have beneficial effects on levels of trade for nearby businesses but that it would not be possible to quantify any potential increases in trade which would result from the proposal.²¹ Given that the Museum in Docklands is already in place and the stated purpose of the proposal is, ultimately, to allow it to remain in existence, it appears to us that the proposal may make it possible for a current benefit to local business to be sustained, rather than the expectation of creating a new benefit to local trade which has not existed hitherto.

36. Subject to that point, we are content that the Department has considered and taken account of the scope for benefits other than savings in preparing the proposal.

Adequate consultation

37. The Department published its consultation document on the proposal on 15 July 2003 and the consultation period extended for three calendar months to 15 October 2003, just over the 12 week minimum recommended in the Cabinet Office Code of Practice on written consultations. The document was circulated to 25 organisations or individuals, including major national and regional museums and representative bodies for professionals in museum administration and policy-making, regional and national government and relevant non-governmental public bodies.

38. The Department did not initially identify all of these consultees in laying the proposal before Parliament; the list of consultees referred, amongst others, to 'Community Organisations' and 'Educational Organisations'. The Department has since indicated that these organisations were the Isle of Dogs Community Foundation and the Director of Education at Tower Hamlets Borough Council. We see no reason why these consultees should not have been named in the Annex to the explanatory statement, and we question why the Department did not choose to do so in the first instance. The consultation document was also made available on three central government websites.

39. Four responses were received. They were from the Corporation of the City of London, the Isle of Dogs Community Foundation, the Standing Conference on London Archaeology and TourEast London.

40. All of those who responded to the consultation document expressed a welcome for the proposal. None of them felt that the proposal would give rise to an adverse effect in respect of the removal of necessary protections or in the preventing of the exercise of any reasonable right or freedom. Although they did not themselves choose to respond to the Department's invitation to comment, both the Board of Governors of the Museum of

²¹ Explanatory statement, p 8

London and the Trustees of the Museum in Docklands favour the proposal, which they have themselves acted to promote.²²

41. **We are content that the proposal has been the subject of adequate consultation.**

6 Conclusion

42. On the evidence currently before us,²³ we conclude that a draft order in the same terms as the proposal should be laid before the House.

22 Explanatory statement, p 4

23 See para. 1 above

Formal minutes

Wednesday 3 March 2004

Members present:

Mr Peter Pike, in the Chair

Mr Russell Brown

Chris Mole

Mr Mark Lazarowicz

Mr Denis Murphy

Mr John MacDougall

Dr Doug Naysmith

The Committee deliberated.

Draft Report (Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Museum of London) (Location of Premises) Order 2004, proposed by the Chairman, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the Chairman's draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 42 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the Fourth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chairman do make the Report to the House.

Several papers were ordered to be appended to the Report.

Ordered, That the Appendices to the Report be reported to the House.

[Adjourned till Wednesday 10 March at 9.30 am

List of written evidence

- A** Letter from the Committee Specialist to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport 16
- B** Letter from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport to the Committee Specialist 17

Appendix A

Letter from the Committee Specialist to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport

Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Museum of London) (Location of Premises) Order 2004: request for further information

I refer to our telephone conversation today.

As we discussed, the Regulatory Reform Committee considered the draft proposal at its meeting today and resolved at that meeting to seek some additional information from the Department in respect of certain points. The issues where the Committee would like further comment are set out below, together with the particular questions which arise on them under the relevant categories for consideration specified in the Regulatory Reform Act and the Committee's Standing Order.

Whether the proposal has been the subject of, and taken appropriate account of, adequate consultation (S.O. No. 141(6)(d))

Annex A to the explanatory statement provides a list of those who were invited to comment as part of the consultation programme which preceded the laying of the proposal for the Order before Parliament. Some of those consultees have been identified in this Annex simply as "community organisations" and "educational organisations".

Q 1 Can you specify the bodies which are being referred to under these two headings in the explanatory statement.

Whether the proposal has been the subject of, and taken appropriate account of, estimates of increases or reductions in costs or other benefits which may result from its implementation (S.O. No. 141(6)(m))

The Committee has noted the section on page 4 of the explanatory memorandum headed **The Need for Change**. The section explains that some unspecified financial difficulties arose in the course of the project to develop the Museum in Docklands in early 2001. These problems, together with the revised view which it then took of the market conditions for museums, led the Heritage Lottery Fund to make a merger between the Museum of London and the Museum in Docklands a condition of the Fund's future financial support for the Museum in Docklands.

The Regulatory Impact Assessment at Annex D to the statement comments further on these issues, to the effect that the Museum in Docklands project might not be financially sustainable without continuing grant aid from the Fund. Although the willingness of the Fund to give financial support for the project seems to be the principal factor determining whether the Museum will continue to exist, the Department has not given any indication of how large the Fund's support is expected to be or the proportion of the Museum's budget which it would be expected to constitute. No information has been given as to whether the Fund's future support is intended to be for capital or revenue purposes.

Q 2 Please indicate the specific nature of the assessment which led the Heritage Lottery Fund to require the merger of the two museums as the condition for its continuing support for the Museum of London.

Q 3 Please give details of the position within the Museum in Docklands overall capital and revenue budgets which the possible future funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund occupies.

As we discussed, I would be grateful to receive your response to the above questions, together with any further information the Department believes would be helpful to the Committee, not later than **Monday, 23 February**.

10 February 2004

Appendix B

Letter from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport to the Committee Specialist

Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Museum of London) (Location of Premises) Order 2004: request for further information

Thank you for your letter of 10 February seeking additional information on the draft Regulatory Reform (Museum of London) (Location of Premises) Order 2004.

I have provided below the responses to the questions raised by the Committee.

Q 1 Can you specify the bodies which are being referred to under these two headings in the explanatory statement.

The consultees listed in Annex A as “community organisations” and “educational organisations” were the ‘Isle of Dogs Community Foundation’ and the Director of Education at Tower Hamlets, respectively. These two bodies were the most relevant bodies in their field to consult with, and the consultation document invited comments from all interested parties, not just those to whom the document had been sent.

Q 2 Please indicate the specific nature of the assessment which led the Heritage Lottery Fund to require the merger of the two museums as the condition for its continuing support for the Museum of London.

Assessment by the Heritage Lottery Fund of the Museum in Docklands Project

From June 2000 onwards the HLF and their Project Monitor were concerned about the future viability of the Museum in Docklands. There were three main issues: the lack of secured funding to support the long-term operation of the museum; the viability of the Museum in Dockland’s Business Plan and the adequacy of the management structure in place to run the museum.

The MoL analysed the MiD’s business plan and believed that it did not properly allow for the operation of the museum as a visitor attraction and that it was too optimistic about the projected visitor numbers.

Furthermore, the MiD trustees were unable to raise all the partnership funding identified in their original lottery application. As late as April 2002, the MiD trustees were confident that an anonymous donor would save the project by contributing £5m endowment towards its running costs, however the monies were not forthcoming.

Delays also occurred in the building works and the museum needed additional funds to cover their pre-opening deficit. The MiD Trustees made a grant application to the HLF for £2m to close this shortfall. The HLF were not prepared to release additional funds until a guarantee of the museum’s future could be given.

On 11 April 2002 at a meeting between Michael Oliver, Chairman of the Museum in Docklands, and Liz Forgan, Chair of the HLF, at the Museum in Docklands, there was a final recognition that the only realistic option was for the Museum in Docklands to move rapidly to a merger with the Museum of London. It was on this basis that the HLF provided additional grants for the pre-opening period and the first three years of operation.

Q 3 Please give details of the position within the Museum in Docklands overall capital and revenue budgets which the possible future funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund occupies.

This table outlines the split between capital and revenue funding allocated to the Museum in Docklands.

	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Capital funding			
HLF	808	0	0
Other sources	0	0	0
Total	808	0	0
Revenue funding			
HLF	340	340	340
DCMS (Note 1*)	475	475	475
Other grant income	146	98	98
Commercial income	127	213	230
Total	1088	1126	1143

*The DCMS funding is the increase in grant to the Museum of London to enable it to operate the Museum in Docklands.

Undated (February 2004)

Reports from the Regulatory Reform Committee since 2001

The following reports were published during the present Parliament by the Regulatory Reform Committee under its previous name, the Deregulation and Regulatory Reform Committee.

Session 2001-02

First	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Special Occasions Licensing) Order 2001	265
Second	Draft Regulatory Reform (Special Occasions Licensing) Order 2001	388
Third	Draft Deregulation (Disposals of Dwelling-Houses By Local Authorities) Order 2001	449
Fourth	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Voluntary Aided Schools Liabilities and Funding) (England) Order 2002	583
Fifth	Draft Deregulation (Restaurant Licensing Hours) Order 2002 Draft Deregulation (Bingo and other Gaming) Order 2002 Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Golden Jubilee Licensing) Order 2002	599
Sixth	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002	663
Seventh	Draft Regulatory Reform (Golden Jubilee Licensing) Order 2002 Draft Regulatory Reform (Voluntary Aided Schools Liabilities and Funding) (England) Order 2002	677
Eighth	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Carer's Allowance) Order 2002	691
Ninth	Draft Deregulation (Correction of Birth and Death Entries in Registers or Other Records) Order 2002 Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Vaccine Damage Payments Act 1979) Order 2002	708
Tenth	Draft Regulatory Reform (Housing Assistance) (England and Wales) Order 2002 Draft Regulatory Reform (Carer's Allowance) Order 2002	807
First Special Report	Further report on the Handling of Regulatory Reform Orders	389

The following Reports were published by the Regulatory Reform Committee during the present Parliament under its current name.

Session 2001-02

Eleventh	Draft Regulatory Reform (Vaccine Damage Payments Act 1979) Order 2002	867
Twelfth	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Removal of the 20 Member Limit) Order 2002	1104
Thirteenth	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Sugar Beet Research and Education) Order 2003	1247
Fourteenth	Draft Regulatory Reform (Removal of 20 Member Limit in Partnerships Etc.) Order 2002	1303
Second Special Report	The Operation of the Regulatory Reform Act: Government Response to the Committee's First Special Report of Session 2001-02	1029
Third Special Report	The Handling of Regulatory Reform Orders (III)	1272

Session 2002-03

First	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Credit Unions) Order 2002 Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Special Occasions Licensing) Order 2002	82
Second	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Business Tenancies) (England and Wales) Order 2003	182
Third	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Assured Periodic Tenancies) (Rent Increases) Order 2003	183
Fourth	Draft Regulatory Reform (Special Occasions Licensing) Order 2002	193
Fifth	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Housing Management Agreements) Order 2003	328
Sixth	Draft Regulatory Reform (Credit Unions) Order 2003 Draft Regulatory Reform (Assured Periodic Tenancies) (Rent Increases) Order 2003	329
Seventh	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Schemes under Section 129 of the Housing Act 1988) (England) Order 2003	436
Eighth	Draft Regulatory Reform (Housing Management Agreements) Order 2003	520
Ninth	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (British Waterways Board) Order 2003	521
Tenth	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Schemes under Section 129 of the Housing Act 1988) (England) Order 2003	549
Eleventh	Draft Regulatory Reform (Sugar Beet Research and Education) Order 2003	591

Twelfth	Draft Regulatory Reform (British Waterways Board) Order 2003	682
Thirteenth	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Gaming Machines) Order 2003	715
Fourteenth	Draft Regulatory Reform (Business Tenancies) (England and Wales) Order 2003 Draft Regulatory Reform (Gaming Machines) Order 2003	1210
First Special Report	The operation of the Regulatory Reform Act 2001: a progress report	908

Session 2003-04

First	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Sunday Trading) Order 2004	108
First Special Report	Government Response to the Committee's First Special Report, Session 2002–03: <i>The operation of the Regulatory Reform Act 2001: a progress report</i>	256
Second	Proposal for the Regulatory Reform (Patents) Order 2004	337
Third	Draft Regulatory Reform (Sunday Trading) Order 2004	338

All reports are available from The Stationery Office.