

The Future of London Methodism

Summary

The Report develops the proposals adopted in outline by the 2002 Conference for regional districts in the south-east area of England. It recommends the formation of a London Regional District from 2006 and transitional arrangements for Circuits north and south of London beyond 2006 until proposals arising from further consultations (including consultations with neighbouring Districts) can be implemented. The key features of a regional district are described.

The Report was prepared by the Co-ordinating Group appointed by the Methodist Council. Its members were:

The Revd Steven Browning [from September 2003]

The Revd Jeremy Dare [until September 2003]

The Revd David Deeks

The Revd Dr Stuart Jordan

Ms Shirley Maginley

Mr Ronald Nathan [until September 2003]

The Revd Clifford Newman

Ms Elizabeth Ovey

The Revd Colin Smith

The Methodist Council agreed to recommend the Report to the Conference, subject to the decisions of the four London District Synods. The Strategy and Resources Committee received the voting results of the London District Synods (see Appendix 4) and, on the basis of these, confirmed the recommendation of the Council.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 In 2002 the Methodist Conference adopted the *Report of the Working Party on London Methodism* recommending the reconfiguration of the four London Districts into three new regional districts. That Report argued that ‘the emergence of a regional district would require a new model – not a version of the existing District “writ large”’ - and recommended that further work be carried out in order to prepare specific proposals for consideration by the Conference.¹
- 1.2 The Co-ordinating Group commissioned by the Methodist Council to undertake that work encouraged extensive consultation² – a process that has significantly shaped the content of this Report.

While recognising the particular issues focused by London, the consultations mainly explored the possibility of creating three new regional districts in line with the 2002 Report. The level of concern raised about the proposed geography and identity of those regional districts has, however, highlighted the need for the

¹ Originally in 2003. An Interim report to the 2003 Conference requested a further year’s extension.

² That process involved meetings of representatives of Circuits within each of the present London Districts and across the proposed regional districts. Individual Circuits and others were invited to respond at each stage. The four District Treasurers were consulted about the financial implications and legal advice was sought about the constitutional implications. Input from ecumenical partners and neighbouring Districts has also been invited.

alternatives to be more fully examined. Meanwhile conversations with neighbouring Districts, further encouraged by the recent connexional review of all Districts, have begun to open up additional possibilities.

1.3 Consequently the present Report is less complete than was originally intended, for there are major issues still to be resolved. It does, however, identify areas of significant agreement and, in particular, recommends:

- the formation of a London Regional District to be implemented in September 2006;
- a further period within which the Circuits of the four London Districts beyond London to the north and south can agree new District arrangements;
- the interim arrangements required to enable the above proposals to be taken forward.

1.4 The proposal for a London Regional District offers a general picture based on some clear principles. It is recognised that more detailed issues will need to be addressed in the subsequent implementation stage, as reflected in 8.1 below.

1.5 In exploring these options the co-ordinating group has been conscious of its limited remit and possibilities and draws particular attention to the fact that:

- it has had no authority to address questions about the role of Districts within the wider Connexion and has not sought to do so;
- while it has endeavoured to sustain an ecumenical perspective and to inform ecumenical partners of the emerging proposals, to date it has seen no practical possibility for active collaboration with those partners in realigning ecumenical boundaries.

2. The Case for a London Regional District

2.1 The changing context

The issue of a London District has been on the Methodist agenda for at least fifty years. It was considered by the Conference Commission of 1951-1953 but rejected when, in 1956, the Conference determined to replace the six London Districts that then existed with the present four.³ The arguments in favour of a single London District were thoroughly rehearsed again through a series of reports brought to the Conference between 1983 and 1987, though in the end failed to find adequate support.

On each of these occasions the perceived benefits of the Church's work and mission in London attributed to the proposed changes were deemed to be less telling than the resourcing issues involved or the consequent implications for those Circuits beyond London and for the wider Connexion.

Since 2000, when the Conference appointed a new working party to consider the future of Methodism in London, it has become clear that many of the familiar

³ A decision shaped in part by the introduction at that same time of the new connexional scheme for separated Chairmen - based on the logistical principle of 30,000 members per District - and the recognition that within such Districts financial support could be available to the inner London Circuits.

arguments on either side of the debate remain. It is equally clear, however, that significant new factors have emerged that make the case for a London Regional District more compelling than ever and more widely accepted.

These include:

- a national programme of regionalisation most clearly expressed in London by the appointment of a Mayor and Greater London Assembly - so creating a new political framework for the city;
- the current growth and changing cultural identity of Methodism in London, where over 50% of all congregational members are now from black or ethnic minority backgrounds – and 25% are from West Africa alone;
- the need recognised across the Connexion for all Districts to review their patterns of work and to explore more effective ways of serving the mission of the Church.

2.2 Current Arrangements for London

Currently five Methodist bodies have an involvement with, and shared responsibility for, Methodist work in London: the four London Districts and the London Committee. While all five work collaboratively as far as they can, even their joint effectiveness in terms of London is limited since:

- each of the four Districts adopts its own procedures and policies and has a majority of its Circuits, churches and members beyond London – as reflected in Synod and Committee membership and business;
- while the London Committee provides a forum for, and overview of, Methodist work in London it has no authority to determine policy and is not primarily constituted for the strategic task.

Attempts have been made in the past to address the situation by significantly enlarging the membership of the London Committee and by convening an occasional London Forum. Both of these were unsuccessful, however, since neither body was integral to the District structures or had any constitutional authority.

While the current arrangements therefore work effectively in some respects, they are fundamentally flawed in being unable to address the needs of London and London Methodism as a whole. As a result there is a lack of clear focus at a city-wide level on civic, social or ecumenical issues, while at a local level numerous neighbouring churches with essentially similar concerns find themselves part of different District structures.

2.3 The Perceived Benefits of a London Regional District

There is a growing recognition that the creation of a London Regional District would facilitate the work and mission of Methodism in a number of important respects:

- 2.3.1 It would enable Methodism to develop a focused and sustained approach to London and to engage more effectively with civic life and public issues.

The sheer scale and significance of London represents a unique context for the Churches as for other bodies. As a global city, financial centre and national capital of seven million inhabitants, it exercises far-reaching political and economic power which invites new forms of Christian presence and engagement.

Alongside its conspicuous wealth London also evidences extensive poverty, deprivation and exclusion.⁴ In addition to the social needs found in many neighbourhoods, this very diversity impacts on the life of local churches and challenges our understanding of what it might mean to be an inclusive Christian community.

The election of a Mayor and Assembly in 2000 has helped to restore some measure of city-wide government, reinforcing the strategic approach of other city-wide bodies such as the Metropolitan Police. Roles and relationships with the Boroughs⁵ are still developing but a new regional reality is clearly emerging – and is one with which the Churches have begun to engage ecumenically and, increasingly, with representatives of other faiths.

Meanwhile, in common with other metropolitan areas, London is in the throes of rapid social change. In addition to the significant flows of daily commuters, its resident population is itself highly mobile, increasingly diverse in terms of ethnicity and culture and experiencing renewed growth. It has recently undergone radical upheaval in employment patterns and social demography. Change on such a scale has created pressure at all levels, challenges many traditional assumptions and requires new ways of working – not least for the Churches.

Whether exercising its pastoral or prophetic ministry within this unique context, Methodism would be better able to contribute to the well being of the city as a whole by focusing responsibility for London within a single Regional District.

- 2.3.2 It would enable a more strategic and creative approach to the development of mission at both local and regional level and to the effective deployment of resources.

While there is great diversity in a city the size of London, many issues are also shared among the London Circuits. Both by embracing such diversity and by identifying common interests, a London Regional District would encourage a more effective and flexible deployment of resources – whether of finance, property, personnel or expertise. This is especially important if the current growth among the Churches is to be properly supported and sustained.

Cultural diversity is a defining feature of many congregations across the whole city. Only a London Regional District could adequately reflect that diversity and encourage greater participation in leadership. That is a particular and urgent challenge with regard to young people who are currently involved locally in significant numbers but may well be lost to the Church unless their concerns and contributions can be actively engaged in new ways.

⁴ See the figures in Appendix 1.

⁵ London is divided into 32 Boroughs plus the Corporation of London which administers the City (otherwise known as the 'Square Mile') - often referred to as the '33 Boroughs'. The Boroughs are the main providers for local communities, responsible for major public services such as health, education, housing and social services.

There is a long and honourable tradition of social caring among the London Churches. Currently many questions are raised about the most effective way to embody Christian compassion and concern for justice at a time of changing needs, additional demands on service providers and restricted resources. A London Regional District could facilitate the sharing of expertise and good practice and encourage a more strategic approach to sustaining such important work. It would also be better able to envision, commission and support specialist ministries and projects that enhance the Church's mission across the whole city.

3. The Proposed London Regional District

- 3.1 **Definition:** It is proposed that a London Regional District should, as far as possible, be coterminous with the outer boundary of the 33 Boroughs that comprise Greater London.⁶

Currently eleven Circuits straddle that boundary by having churches on either side. It is intended that such Circuits be invited to consider, in consultation with their present District, what future arrangement would best facilitate their local mission in the light of the proposed changes.

- 3.2 **Size:** It is anticipated that, on current figures, such a District would consist of approximately:
- 47 Circuits⁷
 - 252 churches
 - 23,000 members
 - 169 presbyters and deacons

- 3.3 **Leadership:** It is essential that such a large District, within such a distinctive context, at a time of growth and increasing complexity, has adequate leadership capacity to develop innovative approaches to its work.

As in any District, such leadership will depend on the gifts of different colleagues, employed and voluntary, lay and ordained. In addition, however, the scale of the work in London – relating to 47 Circuits and their ministers, engaging with city-wide issues and partners, promoting a coherent and strategic approach to mission – requires District leadership to be focused more particularly by a collaborative team of three full-time members.

For practical purposes the three might be understood at this stage as consisting of a Chair and two deputies, though other variants are possible and have their own merits. A prime role for the Chair would be to assume overall responsibility for mission strategy and to take a lead in developing opportunities for Methodism to engage in civic, ecumenical and multi-faith contexts in the wider life of the city.

⁶ While not as visual a description as 'within the M25' this designation more accurately reflects the identity of London as a political entity. The M25 roughly circumscribes the same area, but at a number of points is variously either inside or outside the Greater London boundary.

⁷ For the purpose of the illustrative numbers that follow only, it has been assumed that the nine Circuits with a majority of their churches within a London Borough might opt to become part of the London Regional District. Minor variations from this assumption in practice will not significantly affect what follows.

A prime role of the two deputies would be to assume responsibility for the pastoral and stationing needs of the Circuits and their ministers. The three would together co-ordinate and support the wider leadership team of the District, as well as the Circuit Clusters and Commissions [see below] as most appropriate.

The nature of this work – representative roles in both ecumenical and civic contexts and pastoral care of Circuits and ministers - requires that core team to consist of three presbyters. That could be achieved within the present regional establishment and funding arrangements by replacing three existing presbyteral appointments – those of two London District Chairs and of the London Committee Secretary.

This model would have major advantages. It would provide greater capacity for effective leadership and pastoral care through the collegial exercise of different gifts, styles, and experience. It would offer a means of separating pastoral and disciplinary roles within an integrated team. It would model a supportive and collaborative approach to ministry and leadership that others within the District might be encouraged to adopt.

- 3.4 **Patterns of Work:** The London Regional District would clearly be required to fulfil all the essential tasks required of every other District in the Connexion and would need to create effective procedures appropriate to its context. While the scale of the District would increase the size of those tasks in some respects, it would also increase the pool of human and other resources available to meet them.

While established patterns may be appropriate for some tasks at a District level, two new ways of working are also proposed:

3.4.1. **Clusters** of neighbouring Circuits already work informally in a number of places. A more intentional development of Clusters could benefit their members in various ways by:

- encouraging collaboration and mutual support beyond established, and often restricted, Circuit patterns;⁸
- gathering together a larger pool of local resources and expertise from which others could draw;
- running training, programmes and events that individual Circuits might not be able to provide by themselves;
- enabling opportunities for consultation – where appropriate even replacing some of the consultations currently required of Circuits or Districts;
- providing a more effective forum for addressing community or public concerns.

Clusters should, wherever possible, respect Borough boundaries and ten to twelve Clusters of neighbouring Circuits across two or three Boroughs are envisaged. Representatives of the Clusters could meet at least once a year, e.g. instead of an Autumn Synod, for consultation and planning – otherwise it is to

⁸ Especially important for the significant number of single- or double-station Circuits in London.

be expected and encouraged that the Clusters will evolve different ways of working as appropriate to their own needs.

3.4.2 **Commissions** could provide effective ways of enhancing specific areas of mission across the District by focusing on a limited number of clearly identified priorities.⁹

Their pattern would vary – some would require an annual cycle of activity, others short-term action groups; some would act centrally, others could be devolved. Their work would constitute the major part of the District’s corporate activity and their representatives would provide the core of the District’s policy-making body, supported by those overseeing administrative and resource issues.

3.5 Some Frequently Asked Questions

These proposals have frequently prompted a number of basic questions.

a) *Is the proposed District not too big and unmanageable?*

With 47 Circuits, among a population of seven million people, the proposed District would certainly need to do things differently – but this is a prime opportunity for exploring new patterns of work, as well as a challenge.

b) *Is it financially viable?*

Consultations with the London District Treasurers confirm that all the proposals can be met within existing levels of funding. Details of the financial implications are found in section 6 below.

c) *Would there be enough people to do District jobs?*

The experience of the current Districts is of a shortage of people from London who are willing to get involved. There may be different reasons for this – including the lower profile of London issues on District agendas and established ways of working that are not always accessible to a culturally diverse community. There is a real challenge here to develop alternative leadership patterns and programmes, but new ways of working around a London agenda are more likely to encourage participation.

d) *Won’t a London Regional District deprive the Circuits beyond London of the benefits of cultural diversity?*

Currently Synods and other District gatherings help to remind each of the four London Districts of that diversity. That would not continue to the same extent¹⁰ but there is no reason why groups, congregations or Circuits should not engage with the diversity of London Methodism in new ways. Such intentional engagement is more likely to be productive than the chance encounters that take place at present.

e) *Won’t the new boundaries undermine long-standing links and relationships within the present Districts?*

District boundaries are not actual barriers and need not disrupt such

⁹ While yet to be established and needing to be regularly reviewed, it is envisaged that these might include: children and young people; cultural diversity; evangelism; pastoral care; social care; spirituality; an urban forum; vocations.

¹⁰ Cultural diversity is not of course limited to London congregations - though the scale outside London is of a different order.

links. Sustaining such relationships may require more effort but if they are really valuable that should not be insuperable.

f) Won't the Clusters just create another administrative tier?

Clusters are intended to promote flexible and more effective ways of working - certainly not to duplicate work or create an additional tier. Where they already exist, experience shows that the benefits are significant and the dangers can be avoided.

g) What about the ecumenical dimension?

Church boundaries in London are complex, with each denomination having a different historic arrangement - though most agree that London should ideally be seen as a whole. A London Regional District would relate naturally to such London-wide bodies as the London Baptist Association, the London Church Leaders' Group, the London Churches' Group for Social Action, the Ecumenical Borough Deans and multi-faith networks. Meanwhile the Black independent Churches are increasing in number and significance and a London-wide District would be better able to engage with the new ecumenical reality they are helping to create.

4. District Arrangements Beyond London

- 4.1 The areas covered by the Circuits beyond London to the north and south also represent distinctive contexts in which the Church's mission needs to be discerned and resourced. Following the recommendations in the Conference Report of 2002 it was originally envisaged that each of these areas might themselves become a new regional district - a proposal tested at some length in the recent District consultations. As already indicated, while this remains one option, the Circuits affected also want to explore the alternatives further - while at the same time not wanting to delay arrangements for a London Regional District.
- 4.2 The 27 Circuits beyond London in the present London North-East and North-West Districts have been actively involved in exploring possible District arrangements. As well as considering the option of becoming a new regional district, their discussions with neighbouring Districts [East Anglia and Oxford and Leicester] have suggested that boundary changes involving each of those Districts could create other solutions that are more satisfactory in the long-term. These discussions are understandably complex and are not yet completed.
- 4.3 For the 27 Circuits beyond London in the present London South-West and London South-East Districts, the real boundary of the coast clearly allows much less possibility of geographical flexibility.¹¹ The area covered by those Circuits presents difficult issues of communication and identity which are resistant of any simple solution. As a consequence the Circuits need to explore more fully the different solutions that have been suggested to ensure that they maximise the benefits and minimise the disadvantages of any change.
- 4.4 Two possible models of new District arrangements have been suggested

¹¹ Although conversations with the Southampton District continue.

for consideration by the Circuits beyond London both to the north and the south, once the final boundaries are clearer:

- Each to become one regional district. This would focus the problems of size, identity and communication – all of which would require new and untried ways of working. District gatherings would need to meet centrally. More local identity would need to be created within the District – perhaps by Clusters of Circuits mirroring county or diocesan groupings or by continuing the east and west networks derived from the present Districts. It would, however, focus on the wider region, offer economies of scale and the largest pool of skills and resources.
- Each to continue with two smaller Districts - based on the networks in the east and west derived from the present Districts. This would minimise the need for disruption and the problems of identity and communication. Viability in terms of scale and costs could be a difficulty – though non-separated Chairs might be an option. There would be inevitable duplication of District activities (though some could be shared) and little obvious incentive to explore new ways of working or to address wider regional issues.

4.5 A third model has also been suggested for consideration by the southern Circuits:

- To become five mini-Districts. These would shift the focus to more local, light-weight structures based on county or diocesan boundaries and served by non-separated Chairs. Wider regional focus would be lost, though identity, ease of access and flexibility would be improved. Necessary District functions would be multiplied and the availability of resources – human as well as financial – would be limited. The involvement of five Chairs in connexional activities would be difficult and might require one to represent all - while the creation of extra Districts itself runs counter to current connexional thinking.

4.6 Whatever proposals finally emerge for the Circuits beyond London to the north and south, it is recommended that in the process serious attention is given to the potential contribution of a number of the perspectives proposed for London, in particular:

- models of collaborative leadership
- Clusters of Circuits
- commissions
- the significance of the regional context for mission

5. Shared District Arrangements

The four London Districts together currently benefit from the expertise and support of various full-time personnel: two Training and Development Officers [TDOs], a Diversity Officer [DO]¹², and the lay staff of the London Committee Office - a Finance and Grants Officer and a Secretary/PA.¹³

¹² Funded by the London Districts with the assistance of Connexional and London Mission Fund grants until 2005.

¹³ Funded by the London Office Benefaction - a designated part of the London Mission Fund.

As part of the reconfiguration of the Districts it is recommended that:

- the TDOs and DO form a single training and development team serving both the London Regional District and the new District arrangements for the Circuits beyond London. While each of the team members would have a specific geographical link with one of the Districts and be available to contribute to its core policy development, together they would also be able to offer a range of specialist skills to the region as a whole.
- the work of the London Committee office be refocused to offer administrative support to the London Regional District and, where desired, to the new District arrangements to the north and south. This could include the provision of financial administration in support of the District Treasurer(s) and advice on and processing of property and personnel grants. It is anticipated that, while the management of the London Mission Fund (see 6.5 below) will require a continuing body of trustees, the new District arrangements will supersede all other functions currently carried out by the London Committee.¹⁴
- wherever appropriate, consideration be given to the sharing of specialist provisions - e.g. Safeguarding or Complaints and Discipline procedures - across all the new Districts.

6 Financial Implications¹⁵

None of the above proposals necessarily involve any significant change in overall costs, although some transitional costs may be involved until all the new District arrangements are in place.

6.1 District Leadership: The Methodist Church Fund currently funds four Chairs of District and two TDOs within the region, while the London Office Benefaction funds the London Committee Secretary. If redeployed as suggested above, this continued provision would meet the needs of District leadership so far identified. Should District arrangements beyond London require additional resourcing this would need to be addressed – perhaps by a more flexible use of the London Mission Fund.

6.2 District Expenses: Each of the four London Districts currently budgets an average of £58,700p.a. for District expenses - in addition to their contributions to the Methodist Church Fund [av. £499,000] and the London Mission Fund [av. £23,600]. Together the 47 Circuits likely to comprise the London Regional District contribute £101,000 towards District expenses; those Circuits beyond London to the north contribute £67,000 and to the south £66,000. Each of these would therefore be able to sustain the work of one District at its present level of activity.¹⁶

¹⁴ Should any cross-District consultation or activity be required in future this would be better entrusted to a specialist Commission or working party, rather than to a standing committee.

¹⁵ For a breakdown of the different financial components for each Circuit and District see Appendix 2.

¹⁶ It is difficult to calculate the impact of the extra costs involved in a District as large as that proposed for London, but the larger number of Circuits brings with it more resources, while some economies of scale could also be expected.

6.3 Methodist Church Fund: The combined assessment on the 101 Circuits of the present London Districts will not be affected by the proposals.¹⁷ Each of the four Districts currently allocates its assessment to individual Circuits according to its own formula. This would need to be reviewed within any new District arrangements - but the similarity of the formulae suggests that this is unlikely to lead to any significant differences for individual Circuits.

6.4 Restricted and Designated Funds: A review of restricted and designated funds administered by the four London Districts indicates that in every case, the Circuits or types of work presently benefiting from a specific fund (be they cross-District, within a District or in part of a District) could continue to be beneficiaries within its original terms, whatever final arrangements about District boundaries are made.

6.5 London Mission Fund: Whereas contributions to District expenses and the Methodist Church Fund leave little room for flexibility, the London Mission Fund consists of a number of elements that could support various options under new District arrangements.¹⁸

It is recommended that once the new District arrangements are in place, steps should be taken to release firstly the income and subsequently the capital of the Fund to the Districts that have created and currently sustain it.¹⁹ In the interim it should continue to raise funds and allocate grants, as at present.

7. Constitutional and Legal Implications

It is proposed that the constitutional and legal consequences of these new arrangements should be met by the proposed new powers for Districts to adopt a modified constitution, which are being brought to the Conference separately.

8. Interim Arrangements

In order to progress the above recommendations the following interim arrangements need to be agreed.

8.1 Implementation Groups. The officers of the four London Districts should devise a process to appoint three Implementation Groups commissioned to work with the co-ordinating group [8.3 below] and authorised to produce detailed recommendations for each of the three regions.

8.1.1 An Implementation Group representing those Circuits that will comprise the new London Regional District should develop further the proposals outlined in section 3 above, reporting their recommendations to the 2005 Conference for implementation in September 2006.

8.1.2 An Implementation Group representing those Circuits beyond

¹⁷ £1,998,000 in 2002-03 - based on a connexional formula combining the number of ministers and lay workers with regional indices - none of which would be directly affected by the proposals.

¹⁸ For details of the Fund and possible options see Appendix 3.

¹⁹ In this way the four options outlined in Appendix 3 might be seen as stages in a progressive process, rather than strictly as alternatives.

London to the north should, in light of further conversations with neighbouring Districts, bring proposals for new District arrangements to the 2005 Conference, indicating any necessary transitional arrangements and a firm date for implementation.

8.1.3 An Implementation Group representing those Circuits beyond London to the south should consider further the options for their new District arrangements and bring proposals to the 2005 Conference, indicating any necessary transitional arrangements and a firm date for implementation.

8.2 **Leadership Team for the London Regional District:** Arrangements, reflecting as closely as possible current connexional procedures for the appointment of a District Chair, should be made by the Methodist Council, in consultation with the London Implementation Group, for the designation of the three members of the leadership team of the London Regional District by the 2005 Conference for appointment from September 2006. Those so designated should be authorised to work together with the London Implementation Group from September 2005 to help create and co-ordinate the new District arrangements.

8.3 **The Co-ordination of Further Work**

The Methodist Council should appoint a group to work with the Implementation Groups to monitor and co-ordinate further practical, financial and constitutional implications of this three-fold process as they emerge, in order to ensure their mutual compatibility and their congruence with wider connexional strategies.

9. **Recommendations and Resolutions**

In the light of the foregoing, the recommendations contained in the Report are summarised as follows:

1. That the Conference should approve in principle the formation of a London Regional District which will come into existence on the 1st September 2006 and the boundaries of which will be broadly coterminous with the boundaries of the 33 London Boroughs.
2. That the Conference should approve in principle the proposed collaborative arrangements for fulfilling the role required of the Chair of the new London Regional District outlined in section 3.3 of the Report, including the stationing and financial implications of there being three presbyters sharing that role.
3. That the London Regional District should be governed by a modified constitution adopted in accordance with the provisions of the new Section 48A of Standing Orders which is being brought to the Conference.
4. That the Conference should approve in principle the proposal that those Circuits in the London North-East and the London North-West Districts which will not form part of the London Regional District ('the northern Circuits') should be governed by transitional arrangements during the connexional year 2006-07 and should continue to explore the question of what would be the most appropriate structures for those Circuits thereafter.

5. That the Conference should approve in principle the proposal that those Circuits in the London South-East and the London South-West Districts which will not form part of the London Regional District ('the southern Circuits') should be governed by transitional arrangements during the connexional year 2006-07 and should continue to explore the question of what would be the most appropriate structures for those Circuits thereafter.
6. That the Conference should approve in principle the proposals for the continuance of shared District arrangements set out in section 5 of the Report.
7. That the four existing London Districts in co-operation with the East Anglia, Oxford and Leicester and Southampton Districts, should appoint the following Implementation Groups with the following tasks:
 - (1) a group drawn primarily from the Circuits which will form the London Regional District and with the task of preparing proposals for a modified constitution in accordance with the proposals in section 3 of the Report and for any transitional or other arrangements which may be necessary to establish the London Regional District;
 - (2) a group drawn primarily from the northern Circuits and with the task of preparing proposals for an appropriate District structure (of one or more Districts and in consultation and collaboration as appropriate with other Districts) for those Circuits and for any transitional or other arrangements which may be necessary for the connexional year 2006-07;
 - (3) a group drawn primarily from the southern Circuits and with the task of preparing proposals for an appropriate District structure (of one or more Districts and in consultation and collaboration as appropriate with other Districts) for those Circuits and for any transitional or other arrangements which may be necessary for the connexional year 2006-07.

It is proposed that:

- (1) The Implementation Group for the London Regional District will comprise of 3 representatives from each of the current London Districts, two Chairs of the current London Districts, plus a chair of the Group appointed by the Co-ordinating Group
- (2) The Implementation Group for the northern circuits will comprise of 5 representatives from each of the current London North-East and North-West Districts, including their Chairs, 2 representatives each of the Oxford & Leicester and East Anglia Districts, plus a chair of the Group appointed by the Co-ordinating Group
- (3) The Implementation Group for the southern circuits will comprise of 5 representatives from each of the current London South-West and South-East Districts, including their Chairs, 2 representatives each of the Oxford and Leicester and Southampton Districts, plus a chair of the Group appointed by the Co-ordinating Group.

8. That the Conference should appoint a co-ordinating group to monitor and co-ordinate the work being done by the three Implementation Groups. (*The names of proposed members of the co-ordinating group will be brought to the Conference.*)
9. That the co-ordinating group should report to the Conference of 2005 and the Conference of 2006 the progress of the work of the Implementation Groups and should bring to the Conference, when appropriate, the matters arising out of the work of the Implementation Groups which require the approval of the Conference (including any necessary amendments to Standing Orders and any nominations for designation or appointment).
10. That the Secretary of the Conference, in consultation with the co-ordinating group and following as nearly as may be the provisions of Section 42, should establish a process for the nomination of three presbyters to fulfil the role of Chair of the London Regional District in accordance with the recommendations in the Report; should report the process followed to the Conference of 2005; and should bring those nominations to that Conference for designation with a view to confirmation by the Conference of 2006.

Resolutions

- 62/1 The Conference adopts the Report.
- 62/2 The Conference approves in principle the formation of a London Regional District which will come into existence on the 1st September 2006 and the boundaries of which will be broadly coterminous with the boundaries of the 33 London Boroughs.
- 62/3 The Conference approves in principle the proposed collaborative arrangements for fulfilling the role required of the Chair of the new London Regional District set out in the Report.
- 62/4 The Conference approves in principle the proposals for the future of those Circuits in the London North-East and the London North-West Districts which will not form part of the London Regional District ('the northern Circuits') set out in the Report.
- 62/5 The Conference approves in principle the proposals for the future of those Circuits in the London South-East and the London South-West Districts which will not form part of the London Regional District ('the southern Circuits') set out in the Report.
- 62/6 The Conference approves in principle the proposals for the continuance of shared District arrangements set out in the Report.
- 62/7 The Conference directs the four existing London Districts in co-operation with the East Anglia, Oxford and Leicester and Southampton Districts to appoint Implementation Groups as set out in the Report.

- 62/8 The Conference appoints the following persons to be members of a co-ordinating group to monitor and co-ordinate the work being done by the three Implementation Groups:
- The Revd David Deeks (Secretary of Conference)
Mr Bala Gnanapragasam (London South-East, Circuit Steward London Mission South)
The Revd Dr Stuart Jordan (London Committee Secretary)
Ms Elizabeth Ovey (London South-West, Law & Polity Committee)
The Revd Colin Smith (London North-West: Superintendent Barnet Circuit)
Mrs Verna Thorpe (London North-East, Circuit Steward, London Forest Circuit)
One further person from outside the proposed London Region, to be agreed by the four London Chairs of District.
- 62/9 The Conference directs the co-ordinating group to report to the Conference of 2005 and the Conference of 2006 the progress of the work of the Implementation Groups and to bring to the Conference, when appropriate, the matters arising out of the work of the Implementation Groups which require the approval of the Conference (including any necessary amendments to Standing Orders and any nominations for designation or appointment).
- 62/10 The Conference directs the Secretary of the Conference, in consultation with the co-ordinating group and following as nearly as may be the provisions of Section 42, to establish a process for the nomination of three presbyters to fulfil the role of Chair of the London Regional District in accordance with the recommendations in the Report, to report the process followed to the Conference of 2005 and to bring those nominations to that Conference for designation with a view to confirmation by the Conference of 2006.

Appendix 1

Indices of Deprivation for 354 Local Authorities in the UK [2000]

The national indices of deprivation are based on data from 6 'domains':

- Income
- Employment
- Health and disability
- Education, skills and training
- Housing
- Access to services

The average ranking of all the wards in an Authority - combining data from all six domains - shows²⁰ that :

- 3 London Boroughs are the most deprived authorities in the UK
- 5 London Boroughs appear among the 10 most deprived
- 8 appear among the 30 most deprived

[ranked from 1-354]

| | |
|----------------------|------|
| Tower Hamlets | [1] |
| Hackney | [2] |
| Newham | [3] |
| Islington | [8] |
| Southwark | [9] |
| Lambeth | [21] |
| Barking and Dagenham | [24] |
| Lewisham | [30] |

Further:

- 20 London Boroughs are among the 88 most deprived local authority districts in England that are eligible for Neighbourhood Renewal Funding.²¹

Appendix 2

FINANCIAL DATA

District Budgets 2003-04

| | | London North-East | London North-West | London South-West | London South-East | TOTAL |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Chair and Deputy | Travel, Admin etc | 14350 | 23500 | 17000 | 19000 | 73850 |
| | Manse expenses | 3525 | 8000 | 7400 | 5500 | 24425 |
| Synods etc | Synod Secretary | 1600 | 1250 | 1700 | 1250 | 5800 |
| | Other | 5300 | 4850 | 8700 | 3000 | 21850 |

²⁰ *National Statistics: Focus on London 2003*, p.172

²¹ *The National Strategy Action Plan*, p.15

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--|
| Training and Conferences | | | | | | |
| Ministers and Probationers | 3600 | 6580 | 6000 | 4000 | 20180 | |
| Development in Diversity | 15000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15000 | |
| Self Appraisal | 2050 | 2800 | 1000 | 0 | 5850 | |
| Methodist Conference | 2750 | 4000 | 4000 | 0 | 10750 | |
| Other | 500 | 0 | 0 | 500 | 1000 | |
| Ecumenical | 9000 | 11000 | 7500 | 3250 | 30750 | |
| Pastoral and Benevolent Fund | 0 | 1500 | 0 | 0 | 1500 | |
| Other grants | 8000 | 2000 | 1500 | 17000 | 28500 | |
| Other expenses | 200 | 3110 | 7400 | 500 | 11210 | |
| Industrial mission | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8500 | 8500 | |
| Sabbaticals | 0 | 4730 | 0 | 0 | 4730 | |
| Methodist Church Fund | 501937 | 490662 | 574610 | 431424 | 1998633 | |
| London Mission Fund | 23102 | 23268 | 27740 | 20450 | 94560 | |
| TOTAL | 590914 | 587250 | 664550 | 514374 | 2357088 | |
| <i>Met by</i> | | | | | | |
| Interest | 1800 | 2500 | 0 | 2000 | 6300 | |
| External Grants | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2500 | 2500 | |
| Circuits | 553076 | 572000 | 664506 | 510424 | 2300006 | |
| Reserves | 36038 | 12750 | 44 | -550 | 48282 | |
| TOTAL | 590914 | 587250 | 664550 | 514374 | 2357088 | |

2. Circuit Assessments 2002-03

| District | Circuit No | Circuit Name | District Expenses | Less One-off Rebate | London Mission | Meth Ch Fund | Total |
|----------|------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|-------|
|----------|------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|-------|

North-East

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------|
| London | 1 | City Road | 1328 | -664 | 547 | 10465 | 11676 | |
| | 4 | Tower Hamlets | 1254 | -627 | 517 | 11277 | 12421 | |
| | 5 | Newham | 1941 | -970 | 800 | 17451 | 19222 | |
| | 7 | Hackney | 1418 | -709 | 584 | 12753 | 14046 | |
| | 8 | Stoke | 1046 | -523 | 431 | 9406 | 10360 | |
| | | Newington | | | | | | |
| | 10 | New River | 4884 | -2442 | 2012 | 43913 | 48367 | |
| | 12 | Enfield | 4172 | -2086 | 1719 | 37513 | 41318 | |
| | 14 | Forest | 5432 | -2716 | 2238 | 48845 | 53799 | |
| | 17 | Barking, Dag & Ilford | 2970 | -1485 | 1224 | 26710 | 29419 | |
| | 22 | Romford | 3982 | -1991 | 1640 | 35804 | 39435 | |
| | | | 28427 | -14213 | 11712 | 254137 | 280063 | |
| | Other | 18 | West Essex | 848 | -424 | 349 | 7627 | 8400 |
| | | 19 | Bishop's Stortford | 1773 | -887 | 731 | 15945 | 17562 |
| 20 | | Cambridge | 3409 | -1705 | 1405 | 30655 | 33764 | |
| 21 | | Huntingdon | 2209 | -1104 | 910 | 19860 | 21875 | |
| 23 | | South Essex | 3615 | -1807 | 1489 | 32503 | 35800 | |
| 24 | | Southend & Leigh | 5966 | -2983 | 2458 | 53645 | 59086 | |
| 27 | | Chelmsford | 3690 | -1845 | 1520 | 33180 | 36545 | |
| 28 | | Colchester | 2857 | -1429 | 1177 | 25692 | 28297 | |
| 29 | | Manningtree & Harwich | 1180 | -590 | 486 | 9797 | 10873 | |
| 30 | | Clacton-on-Sea | 2101 | -1051 | 866 | 18896 | 20812 | |
| | | | 27648 | -13825 | 11391 | 247800 | 273014 | |
| DISTRICT TOTAL | | | 56075 | -28038 | 23103 | 501937 | 553077 | |

North-West

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----|-----------------------|--------------|--|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| London | 1 | West London | 1837 | | 736 | 15519 | 18092 |
| | 2 | North & Central | 1002 | | 401 | 8465 | 9868 |
| | 3 | North West | 1998 | | 801 | 16882 | 19680 |
| | 4 | Notting Hill | 504 | | 202 | 4262 | 4968 |
| | 6 | Harrow | 5811 | | 2328 | 49101 | 57240 |
| | 7 | Finchley & Hendon | 2643 | | 1059 | 22334 | 26036 |
| | 8 | Wembley | 1856 | | 744 | 15684 | 18284 |
| | 9 | Harlesden | 833 | | 334 | 7037 | 8204 |
| | 10 | Barnet | 1996 | | 800 | 16864 | 19660 |
| | | | 18480 | | 7405 | 156148 | 182032 |
| Other | 11 | Watford | 2685 | | 1076 | 22691 | 26452 |
| | 12 | Hemel H & Berkhamsted | 1933 | | 775 | 16333 | 19040 |
| | 13 | St Albans & Welwyn | 3316 | | 1329 | 28016 | 32660 |

| | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| 14 | Harpenden | 3217 | 1289 | 27185 | 31692 |
| 15 | North Herts | 3168 | 1269 | 26767 | 31204 |
| 18 | Luton | 2942 | 1179 | 24862 | 28984 |
| 19 | Lea Valley | 1313 | 526 | 11097 | 12937 |
| | North | | | | |
| 21 | Dunstable | 2031 | 814 | 17159 | 20004 |
| 22 | Bedford (North) | 2309 | 925 | 19513 | 22748 |
| 23 | Bedford (S) & Amphill | 2586 | 1036 | 21853 | 25476 |
| 24 | Biggleswade | 1390 | 557 | 11743 | 13690 |
| 25 | Leighton B & Stewkley | 1921 | 770 | 16233 | 18924 |
| 26 | Milton Keynes | 2590 | 1038 | 21884 | 25512 |
| 27 | High Wycombe | 3076 | 1233 | 25995 | 30304 |
| 28 | Amersham | 2099 | 841 | 17737 | 20677 |
| 29 | Aylesbury | 2059 | 825 | 17396 | 20280 |
| 30 | Thame & Watlington | 953 | 382 | 8050 | 9384 |
| | | 39588 | 15864 | 334514 | 389968 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| DISTRICT TOTAL | | 58070 | 23268 | 490662 | 572000 |
|---------------------------|--|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|

South-West

| | | | | | | |
|--------|----|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| London | 1 | Westminster | 1032 | 460 | 9523 | 11015 |
| | 2 | Victoria & Chelsea | 467 | 209 | 4312 | 4988 |
| | 3 | Clapham | 1377 | 615 | 12721 | 14713 |
| | 4 | Battersea Central | 487 | 217 | 4492 | 5196 |
| | 5 | Lambeth & Vauxhall | 431 | 193 | 3989 | 4613 |
| | 7 | Hammersmith & Fulham | 1092 | 488 | 10098 | 11678 |
| | 8 | Richmond & Hounslow | 1897 | 847 | 17537 | 20281 |
| | 9 | Teddington | 1485 | 663 | 13727 | 15875 |
| | 10 | Ealing (Trinity) | 2636 | 1176 | 24364 | 28176 |
| | 12 | Hillingdon | 1966 | 878 | 18183 | 21027 |
| | 13 | Wimbledon | 2102 | 938 | 19441 | 22481 |
| | 14 | Wandle Valley | 2744 | 1224 | 25371 | 29339 |
| | 15 | Kingston-upon- Thames | 2531 | 1129 | 23394 | 27054 |
| | 18 | Sutton | 5025 | 2243 | 46465 | 53733 |
| | | | 25272 | 11280 | 233617 | 270169 |
| Other | 16 | Staines & Feltham | 1607 | 717 | 14841 | 17165 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| 17 | Thames Valley | 3548 | 1584 | 32809 | 37941 |
| 19 | Redhill & East Grinstead | 3335 | 1489 | 30833 | 35657 |
| 20 | Dorking & Horsham | 2246 | 1002 | 20771 | 24019 |
| 21 | Mid Sussex | 2887 | 1289 | 26700 | 30876 |
| 22 | Eastbourne | 2470 | 1102 | 22819 | 26391 |
| 23 | Brighton & Hove | 2370 | 1058 | 21921 | 25349 |
| 25 | Worthing | 4680 | 2088 | 43266 | 50034 |
| 26 | Guildford | 2760 | 1232 | 25514 | 29506 |
| 27 | Farnham & Alton | 1303 | 581 | 12038 | 13922 |
| 29 | Woking & Walton | 3297 | 1471 | 30473 | 35241 |
| 30 | Aldershot, Farn, Cam | 4386 | 1958 | 40571 | 46915 |
| 31 | South East Berks | 1823 | 813 | 16854 | 19490 |
| 32 | Gibraltar | 171 | 77 | 1581 | 1829 |
| | | 36883 | 16461 | 340991 | 394335 |
| DISTRICT TOTAL | | 62155 | 27741 | 574608 | 664504 |

South-East

| | | | | | | |
|--------|----|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| London | 1 | South London | 2113 | 738 | 15668 | 18519 |
| | 2 | Brixton | 1789 | 625 | 13281 | 15695 |
| | 3 | South East | 949 | 332 | 7093 | 8374 |
| | 4 | Streatham & Dulwich | 1332 | 465 | 9913 | 11710 |
| | 5 | Sydenham & Forest Hill | 1654 | 578 | 12289 | 14521 |
| | 6 | Walworth | 2214 | 773 | 16413 | 19400 |
| | 7 | Blackheath & Lewisham | 1608 | 562 | 11949 | 14119 |
| | 8 | Shooters Hill | 1473 | 515 | 10957 | 12945 |
| | 9 | Plumstead | 1719 | 601 | 10070 | 12390 |
| | 10 | Bromley | 2841 | 992 | 21031 | 24864 |
| | 11 | Orpington | 2683 | 937 | 19871 | 23491 |
| | 12 | Chislehurst | 1899 | 663 | 14090 | 16652 |
| | 13 | Croydon | 4419 | 1543 | 32660 | 38622 |
| | 14 | Purley | 2741 | 958 | 20300 | 23999 |
| | | | 29434 | 10282 | 215585 | 255301 |
| Other | 15 | Kent Thameside | 3174 | 1108 | 23485 | 27767 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| 16 | Sevenoaks | 1125 | 393 | 9087 | 10605 |
| 17 | Tunbridge Wells | 1658 | 579 | 12315 | 14552 |
| 18 | Tonbridge | 1360 | 475 | 10122 | 11957 |
| 19 | Hastings Bexhill & Rye | 3900 | 1362 | 28837 | 34099 |
| 20 | Medway | 2731 | 954 | 20222 | 23907 |
| 21 | Maidstone | 2520 | 880 | 18670 | 22070 |
| 22 | Sittingb'rne & Sheerness | 1555 | 543 | 11558 | 13656 |
| 23 | St Augustine's | 1835 | 641 | 13720 | 16196 |
| 24 | North East Kent | 1001 | 349 | 7474 | 8824 |
| 25 | Thanet | 2051 | 716 | 15213 | 17980 |
| 26 | Dover & Deal | 2141 | 748 | 14777 | 17666 |
| 27 | Folkestone | 2010 | 702 | 14911 | 17623 |
| 28 | Ashford | 2056 | 718 | 15250 | 18024 |
| | | 29117 | 10168 | 215641 | 254926 |
| DISTRICT TOTAL | | 58551 | 20450 | 431226 | 510227 |

3. 2002-03 Circuit assessments reallocated to new regional districts

| | District Expenses | Less Rebate | London Mission | Meth Ch Fund | Total |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| London Regional District | | | | | |
| London North East | 28427 | -14213 | 11712 | 254137 | 280063 |
| London North | 18480 | | 7405 | 156148 | 182032 |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| West London | 25272 | | 11280 | 233617 | 270169 |
| South West London | 29434 | | 10282 | 215585 | 255301 |
| South East Total | 101613 | -14213 | 40679 | 859487 | 987565 |
| North London | 27648 | -13825 | 11391 | 247800 | 273014 |
| North East London | 39588 | | 15864 | 334514 | 389968 |
| North West Total | 67236 | -13825 | 27255 | 582314 | 662982 |
| South London | 36883 | | 16461 | 340991 | 394335 |
| South West London | 29117 | | 10168 | 215641 | 254926 |
| South East Total | 66000 | 0 | 26629 | 556632 | 649261 |

Appendix 3

The London Mission Fund

As part of the proposals for the future of the London Districts, attention will need to be given to the future role of the London Mission Fund. This paper gives some brief

background to the Fund, suggests four possible options and includes a summary of recent financial information.²²

Background to the Fund

1. The current London Mission Fund (LMF) originates in two earlier Funds serving the churches of London:
 - the Metropolitan Building and Extension Fund [1861] set up to secure strategic sites and build new chapels in the expanding Victorian city;
 - the London Mission Fund [1885] supporting service and evangelism in the new London Mission Circuits.

Since 1972 the scope of the Fund has been extended and it is now available to support the work of all Circuits in the four London Districts.

2. The Fund currently has three main sources of income from:
 - historical assets (cash and property)
 - annual contributions from the four London Districts and their Circuits, raised as part of the District Assessments
 - annual voluntary contributions from individual churches and Circuits of the four London Districts
3. The Fund currently distributes approximately £350,000p.a. in property and ministry grants:
 - in the case of property grants these are additional to any grants provided by the Connexional Property Committee
 - in the case of ministry grants, these are not additional but contribute towards the connexional package (currently 65% to all *Fund for Home Mission* grants and 25% for all *Connexional Advance and Priority Fund* grants approved in the London Districts)
4. In addition part of the Fund is designated, in accord with the original benefaction, for the provision of a London office and staff (three full-time).
5. The Fund is administered by the London Committee who act as managing trustees appointed by the Methodist Council. The Committee comprises twenty-one members, sixteen of whom represent the four Districts, including all four Chairs.

Possible Options

There seem to be four main options for the future of the Fund as follows:

1. The Fund could continue intact

In this case the present financial arrangements would continue. Income would still be raised via the Districts and directly from the Circuits, while grant support at the present level would remain.

In a new London District most of the London Committee's other business would be superseded, but it could continue to act as managing trustees of the Fund.

Advantages:

- the Fund would continue to raise significant new income each year

²² See also S.O. 363 for constitutional details.

- a regional source of grant-making would continue
- the support and expertise associated with grant-making (particularly advice on funding for property schemes) would continue

Disadvantages:

- continuity might represent a lost opportunity to bring policy-making and resources closer together at a District level
- the resources of the Fund might be deployed more flexibly if devolved

2. The Fund could continue at a reduced level

It would be possible to separate out some of the present constitutive elements. The historic investments could still be used for grant purposes (c. £200,000 p.a.) while new moneys from District Assessment and voluntary Circuit contributions are allocated directly to District Mission Funds.²³

Advantages:

- this would provide extra resources (c. £37,000p.a.) directly to each of the Districts
- it would retain a reduced central reserve and grant-making facility

Disadvantages:

- the capacity for central grant-making would be significantly reduced and its administration less cost-effective
- there may be a significant risk to the £60,000 of voluntary contributions currently received from the Circuits
- some new understanding regarding connexional ministry grants would be required

3. The income of the Fund could be distributed.

The income from the historic investment could be dispersed by the trustees each year to the new Districts according to a formula reflecting the location of Circuits that are current beneficiaries/contributors. Additionally, new moneys could be raised directly by the Districts and their Circuits as in 2 above.

Advantages:

- this would maximise income available directly to the Districts
- grant-making procedures would be simplified

Disadvantages:

- central grant-making would cease and the support and expertise associated with grant-making (particularly advice on funding for property schemes) would be lost
- there may be a significant risk to the £60,000 of voluntary contributions currently received from the Circuits
- some new understanding regarding connexional ministry grants would be required

²³ Or to District Advance Funds – although their restrictions on use might be greater.

4. The capital and income of the Fund could be distributed

In addition to 3 above, it would be possible over time to realise the capital asset of the Fund and to distribute that too to the new Districts.

Advantages:

- this would maximise all resources directly available to the Districts
- grant-making procedures would be simplified

Disadvantages:

- the capital reserve would be fully exhausted
- central grant-making would cease and the support and expertise associated with grant-making would be lost
- there may be a significant risk to the £60,000 of voluntary contributions currently received from the Circuits
- some new understanding regarding connexional ministry grants would be required

London Mission Fund: Summary of Financial Information

| Income and Expenditure | 2001-02 | | 2002-03 | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------|----------------|------|
| | £000 | % | £000 | % |
| <u>Income</u> | | | | |
| District Income | 89.1 | 17.4 | 91.8 | 16.5 |
| Circuit Income | 56.6 | 11.1 | 60.2 | 10.8 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|
| Investments | 355.4 | 69.6 | 322 | 57.8 |
| Other | 9.7 | 1.9 | 82.7 | 14.9 |
| | 510.8 | | 556.7 | |
| <u>Expenditure</u> | | | | |
| Grants | 365.8 | 70.8 | 342.4 | 65.1 |
| Office | 115.8 | 22.4 | 117.8 | 22.4 |
| Committee and Programme | 19.8 | 3.8 | 22.5 | 4.3 |
| Property Management | 15.5 | 3.0 | 43.3 | 8.2 |
| | 516.9 | | 526.0 | |

**Summary of Balance
Sheet 31/08/2003**

£000's

| | |
|------------------------|--------|
| London Office | 1005.9 |
| Benefaction | |
| Non-investment | 1378.9 |
| Properties | |
| 1985 Loan Fund | 446.6 |
| Property Re-Investment | 1415.9 |
| Reserve | |
| Projects Fund | 77.3 |
| General Purposes | 3707.7 |
| | 8032.3 |

Held as

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| Freely Marketable | 2056 |
| Properties | |
| Non Marketable | 326.3 |
| Properties | |
| Beneficial Interests | 1826 |
| Equipment less depreciation | 3.8 |
| Investments | 3213.4 |
| Current Assets | 606.8 |
| | 8032.3 |

Appendix 4

Voting Figures from the London Synods

At their Spring Synods in 2004 the four London Districts each considered the Report and voted on the following resolution:

‘This Synod endorses the *Future of London Methodism Report* and supports the way forward set out in the recommendations in section 9.’

The results of the voting were:

| | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| London North-East | 162 for 37 against | 81.4% in favour |
| London North-West | 220 for 3 against | 98.6% in favour |
| London South-West | 217 for 7 against | 96.8% in favour |
| London South-East | 158 for 55 against | 74.1% in favour |
| Across the four Districts: | 757 for 102 against | 88.1% in favour |