

**MOTIONS ON RESTORATION AND RENEWAL OF THE PALACE OF WESTMINSTER**  
**EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM**

**Restoration and Renewal (No. 1)**

This motion accepts, in principle, that only essential works to the services of the Palace of Westminster should take place during the course of this Parliament. In practice this would mean planned and reactive maintenance, Strategic Estates projects and programmes which are already in progress (including the Elizabeth Tower, cast iron roofs and Westminster Hall), and a further round of medium-term mechanical and electrical work which will be required to mitigate the risks of catastrophic building failure.

The motion reaffirms the House's commitment that the Palace of Westminster will remain the home of the UK Parliament and further specifies that the House will be required to review before the end of the Parliament whether there is the need for a comprehensive programme of works.

**Restoration and Renewal (No. 2)**

This motion invites the House to authorise the next stages of the Programme for the Restoration and Renewal of the Palace of Westminster, including any necessary preliminary works. A detailed account of the Programme and its history is set out in the First Report of the Joint Committee on the Palace of Westminster of Session 2016–17, *Restoration and Renewal of the Palace of Westminster* (HL Paper 41, HC 659).

In 2012, the House of Commons Commission and the House Committee of the House of Lords agreed that the Palace of Westminster should continue to be Parliament's long-term home, ruling out any option that would involve constructing a brand new building away from Westminster. The motion reaffirms the position that, even if there is an essential period of temporary relocation, both Houses will return to their historic home in the Palace of Westminster when the work is complete.

The Joint Committee on the Palace of Westminster noted that the R&R Programme would require engineering and construction capability beyond anything that Parliament currently retains for routine maintenance and projects. The Committee emphasised the need to create a clearly identifiable client for the Programme, akin to a non-executive board, with a deep understanding of the work of both Houses, but also distinct from Parliament and dedicated to the R&R Programme.

The Joint Committee recommended the establishment of a two-tier governance structure, comprising a Sponsor Board (which would be the client) and a Delivery Authority (which would deliver the Programme on the Sponsor Board's behalf). This model proved successful in delivering major projects such as the London 2012 Olympic Games and Crossrail.

The Sponsor Board would fulfil the following tasks:

- appointing and overseeing the work of the Delivery Authority,
- becoming guardian of the scope of the Programme, as agreed by Parliament,
- liaising and communicating with members, and other stakeholders, about the Programme,
- agreeing and overseeing both the budget and overall delivery of the Programme,
- securing the funding, and
- providing one or more spokespeople for the Programme, and a sense of continuity.

In order to give it a degree of independence from Parliament, the Sponsor Board would be established as an arms'-length, statutory body.

It is envisaged that the Delivery Authority could be a non-profit-making company limited by guarantee, owned and appointed by the Sponsor Body and accountable to it. It would have its own Chair and Board of Directors. It would employ its own staff, and the Board would have the management capacity and expertise to enter into contracts with a commercial delivery partner or partners and provide the additional client-side expertise needed to procure and manage the supply chain.

Both the Sponsor Body and the Delivery Authority would be established first in shadow form while legislation is being considered by Parliament, to oversee preparatory work on the Programme, including the further scoping of the three options for delivering the R&R Programme set out below, and be ready to take on their formal functions as soon as possible after the legislation is passed.

In 2013, the House of Commons Commission and the House Committee of the House of Lords commissioned an independent appraisal of possible options for delivering the R&R Programme from a consortium of industry experts led by Deloitte and including AECOM and HoK. This Independent Options Appraisal (IOA), which was published in June 2015, set out three options:

- A defined rolling programme of substantial repairs and replacement over a period of several decades, working around the continued occupation of the Palace by Parliament. The IOA estimated that this option could take between 25 and 40 years, with 32 years being the most likely. The building would be divided into 12 construction zones (plus the basement) which would be tackled one at a time, with the occupants moved to alternative accommodation, including temporary structures in the courtyards and other open spaces. This would include both Chambers, which would have to be vacated separately for between two and four years each. This Option has been ruled out.
- Conducting the work in two phases, with first one House, then the other, being moved to an off-site location. One half of the building would remain in operation while the other half became a building site. The IOA estimated that this option could take between nine and 14 years, with 11 years being the most likely.
- Full decant, with both Houses moving out of the Palace of Westminster (but not the rest of the Parliamentary Estate) for the duration of the works. For this Option, the IOA estimated a possible duration of between five and eight years, with six years being the most likely.

The Joint Committee recommended the adoption of the third option, full decant, as the option which would allow the works to be completed in the shortest possible time-frame, minimise the risk of disruption to the day-to-day operation of Parliament, be likely to involve the lowest capital cost, minimise the risk to safety of construction operatives and occupants, minimise the risk to the Programme itself, and provide the greatest scope for meeting the needs of a 21st Century Parliament building.

The Motion instructs the shadow bodies to carry out further work on three delivery options:

- The full decant option recommended by the Joint Committee.
- Conducting the work in two phases, with first one House, then the other, being moved to an off-site location (as set out in the IOA).
- A third option, which involves full decant but with the retention of a “Parliamentary foothold” during the construction period. This could involve ongoing access to the Elizabeth Tower for Members’ pre-booked tour groups and the use of Westminster Hall for the State Opening of Parliament and for swearing in following a general election.

When the analysis is complete, the Sponsor Board will select a preferred option and prepare a business case to be brought back to both Houses for approval. Work on the Programme will then proceed to the design phase.

These governance arrangements are subject to the agreement of both House Commissions, following the debates in both Houses, and the passage of legislation.