The Lord Mayor will take the Chair at ONE of the clock in the afternoon precisely.



COMMON COUNCIL

SIR/MADAM,

You are desired to be at a Court of Common Council, at **GUILDHALL**, on **THURSDAY** next, **the 10th day of October, 2019.**

JOHN BARRADELL, Town Clerk & Chief Executive.

Guildhall, Wednesday 2nd October 2019

Sir Charles Bowman

Robert Hughes-Penney

Aldermen on the Rota

1 Apologies

2 Declarations by Members under the Code of Conduct in respect of any items on the agenda

3 Minutes

To agree the minutes of the meeting of the Court of Common Council held on 12 September 2019.

For Decision (Pages 1 - 24)

4 Vote of Thanks to the Lord Mayor

To read the draft terms of a Vote of Thanks to The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor.

5 Letter

The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor to lay before the Court a letter of the Lord Mayor Elect declaring his assent to take upon himself that Office.

6 Resolutions on Retirements, Congratulatory Resolutions, Memorials

7 Mayoral Visits

The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor to report on his recent overseas visits.

8 Election of Chief Commoner

To elect a Chief Commoner for 2020/21.

Two nominations have been received in accordance with Standing Order No. 18, as follows:

- Ann Holmes
- Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney

The candidates' supporting statements are the subject of a printed and circulated report.

(N.B. A notice listing the candidates and their nominators is on display in the Members' Reading Room).

For Decision (Pages 25 - 26)

9 **Policy Statement**

To receive a statement from the Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee.

10 **Docquets for the Hospital Seal**

11 The Freedom of the City

To consider a circulated list of applications for the Freedom of the City.

For Decision (Pages 27 - 32)

12 Legislation

To receive a report setting out measures introduced into Parliament which may have an effect on the services provided by the City Corporation.

For Information (Pages 33 - 34)

13 Ballot Results

The Town Clerk to report the outcome of the ballot taken at the last Court: Where appropriate:-

★ denotes appointed.

One Member to the **Board of Governors of the Museum of London**.

	Votes
Randall Keith Anderson	16
Mark Bostock	16
Tijs Broeke	25 ★
John Petrie	21
Jeremy Lewis Simons	19

With no candidate obtaining 50% of the first preference votes, as set out in standing orders the candidates with fewest first preference votes were eliminated and second (and further) preference votes (as appropriate and where indicated) were transferred. With no candidate receiving more than 50% of the vote, this process continued until only two candidates remained, Tijs Broeke and Jeremy Simons.

After all preference votes had been allocated, **Tijs Broeke** was elected with a total of **35 votes**. Jeremy Simons received 32 votes.

For Information

14 **Appointments**

To consider the following appointments:

Where appropriate:-

(A) Two Members on the **Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls**, one vacancy for the balance of a term expiring in July 2022 and one vacancy for the balance of a term expiring in July 2021.

Nominations received:-

Mark Bostock Mary Durcan

(B) Two Members on the **Standards Appeals Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2020.

Nominations received:-

Simon D'Olier Duckworth, O.B.E., D.L. Tracey Graham

(C) One Member on the **Homerton University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust**, for the balance of a term expiring in March 2021.

^{*} denotes a Member standing for re-appointment

Nominations received:-

Randall Keith Anderson

(D) One Member on the **Central Foundation Schools of London**, for a term expiring in September 2023.

Nominations received:-

*Alderman Robert Picton Seymour Howard

For Decision

15 Questions

16 Motions

By Deputy Joyce Carruthers Nash, O.B.E.

(A) "That Adrian Bastow be appointed to the Planning and Transportation Committee for the Ward of Aldersgate, in the room of Barbara Newman?"

By Deputy Tom Sleigh

(B) To consider a Motion, submitted by Deputy Tom Sleigh, expressing support for the independence of the judiciary.

For Decision (Pages 35 - 36)

17 Awards and Prizes

18 Policy and Resources Committee

To consider recommendations relating to a Governance Review.

For Decision (Pages 37 - 40)

19 Hospitality Working Party of the Policy and Resources Committee

To consider recommendations concerning the provision of hospitality.

For Decision (Pages 41 - 44)

20 Planning and Transportation Committee

To consider recommendations relating to the regulation of dockless vehicles on the highway and public places.

For Decision (Pages 45 - 52)

21 Port Health and Environmental Services Committee

To consider the closure of the Signor Pasquale Favale Marriage Portions Charity.

For Decision

(Pages 53 - 58)

22 Community and Children's Services Committee

To consider an amendment to the Committee's Terms of Reference.

For Decision (Pages 59 - 60)

MOTION

23 By the Chief Commoner

That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business below on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

For Decision

24 Non-Public Minutes

To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting of the Court held on 12 September 2019.

For Decision

(Pages 61 - 64)

25 Finance Committee

To consider the award of a contract for software and maintenance services.

For Decision

(Pages 65 - 66)



Item No: 3



ESTLIN, MAYOR

LUDER, LOCUM TENENS

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

12th September 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT

ALDERMEN

Nicholas Anstee Sir Charles Edward Beck Bowman Emma Edhem Sir Roger Gifford Prem Goyal David Andrew Graves Timothy Russell Hailes Robert Picton Seymour Howard Robert Charles Hughes-Penney Sheriff Vincent Thomas Keaveny Alastair John Naisbitt King Susan Langley Ian David Luder Nicholas Stephen Leland Lyons Professor Michael Raymond Mainelli Sir Andrew Charles Parmley William Anthony Bowater Russell Sir David Hugh Wootton Sir Alan Colin Drake Yarrow

COMMONERS

George Christopher Abrahams Caroline Kordai Addy Munsur Ali Rehana Banu Ameer Randall Keith Anderson Alexander Robertson Martin Barr Douglas Barrow Adrian Mark Bastow John Bennett Peter Gordon Bennett Nicholas Michael Bensted-Smith Mark Bostock Deputy Keith David Forbes Bottomley Deputy David John Bradshaw Tijs Broeke Michael John Cassidy Deputy Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick John Douglas Chapman Dominic Gerard Christian

Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst Karina Dostalova Peter Gerard Dunphy Mary Durcan John Ernest Edwards Deputy Kevin Malcolm Everett Anne Helen Fairweather Sophie Anne Fernandes Marianne Bernadette Fredericks Tracey Graham Caroline Wilma Haines Graeme Harrower Christopher Michael Hayward Christopher Hill Deputy Tom Hoffman Ann Holmes Michael Hudson Deputy Wendy Hyde Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark Deputy Clare James

Deputy Henry Llewellyn Michael Angus Knowles-Cutler Gregory Alfred Lawrence Vivienne Littlechild Oliver Arthur Wynlayne Lodge Edward Lord, Deputy Paul Nicholas Martinelli Andrew Paul Mayer Jeremy Mayhew Deputy Catherine McGuinness Andrew Stratton McMurtrie Deputy Robert Allan Merrett Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney Deputy Alastair Michael Moss Sylvia Doreen Moys Benjamin Daniel Murphy Deputy Joyce Carruthers Nash, Barbara Patricia Newman Graham Packham

Dhruv Patel John Petrie William Pimlott Judith Pleasance Jason Paul Pritchard Stephen Douglas Quilter Deputy Richard David Regan Deputy Elizabeth Rogula James de Sausmarez Ruby Sayed John George Stewart Scott Ian Christopher Norman Seaton Jeremy Lewis Simons Deputy Tom Sleigh Sir Michael Snyder Deputy James Michael Douglas Thomson Deputy John Tomlinson James Richard Tumbridge William Upton QC Dawn Linsey Wright

Locum Tenens

The Town Clerk reported that the Lord Mayor was unable to preside over this meeting of the Court as he was engaged on an official visit to Australia. Accordingly, this day was produced and read in Court a Warrant, signed by the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, appointing Alderman Ian Luder as Locum Tenens to transact all the business appertaining to the Office of Mayoralty of this City during his absence.

1. Introduction of New Members

The following Members, lately elected to be of the Common Council, for the Wards mentioned, were introduced to the Court and having, previously made the declaration prescribed by the Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, took their seats, viz.:

Name Ward

Dawn Linsey Wright Coleman Street
John Ernest Edwards Farringdon Within

2. Apologies The apologies of those Members unable to attend this meeting of the Court were

noted.

3. Declarations There were none.

4. Minutes Resolved – That the Minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.

5. Resolutions There were none.

6. Lord Mayor's There was no report.

Visits

7. Policy The Policy Chair spoke to update Members on Brexit readiness, Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) preparedness, and international engagement.

8. Hospital Seal There were no docquets to be sealed.

9. Freedoms The Chamberlain, in pursuance of the Order of this Court, presented a list of the under-mentioned persons who had made applications to be admitted to the

Freedom of the City by Redemption:-

David Thomas Banning Wigga Journalist / BroadcasterChelsea, LondonMervyn Doreen ReddingCitizen and Basketmaker

Lawrence John Day Citizen and Maker of Playing

Cards

Dr Otto Von Feigenblatt an Academic Loxahatchea, Florida, United

States of America

Frederick Joseph Trowman Citizen and Loriner

Donald Mostyn Morris Citizen and Distiller

Joshua William Elvin a Student Wokingham, Berkshire

Elizabeth Mary Elvin Citizen and Glover
Ann Elizabeth Esslemont Citizen and Glover

Aleksander Adam Laskawer a Technology Manager Casekow, Poland

Michael Richard Adkins Citizen and Water Conservator

John Parry Citizen and Loriner

Ellen Elizabeth Murphy a Technology Support Great Totham, Essex

Nicholas John Anstee, Ald.

Manager

Citizen and Butcher

John Douglas Chapman, CC Citizen and Common Councilman

Henry James Redknapp a Football Manager, retired Poole, Dorset

Gordon Warwick Haines Citizen and Needlemaker
Caroline Wilma Haines. CC Citizen and Educator

Grace Enatufe a Cleaner Deptford, London Timothy Russell Hailes, Ald., JP Citizen and International Banker Marianne Bernadette Fredericks, Citizen and Baker **Denise Anne Kennedy** a Tour Manager and Guide, Muswell Hill, London retired Christopher Thomas Edge Citizen and Chartered Secretary & Administrator Derek Francis Forbes Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawers **Brian Frederick Shailer** a Banker, retired Twickenham, London Clive Albert Francis Lambert Citizen and Carman David John Inker Citizen and Carman a Company President Kiev, Ukraine **Karina Bagration** Frederick Joseph Trowman Citizen and Loriner David Robert Boston Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer Penelope Jane Cox McNeill a Registered Nurse Salisbury, Wiltshire Citizen and Cutler Deputy Richard David Regan, OBE Anne Regan Citizen and Fletcher **Christopher William James** a Car Cleaning Company Brentwood, Essex Director Peter Desmond Robinson Citizen and Butcher David Victor Harrison Citizen and Butcher **Danny Chaney** a Construction Company Sittingbourne, Kent Chief Executive Officer Vincent Dignam Citizen and Carman Marianne Bernadette Fredericks, Citizen and Baker CCa Street Environment Officer **Paul Norman Callaghan** Rayners Lane, Harrow Jonathan Martin Averns Citizen and Fletcher David Andrew Harry McGregor Citizen and Cook Smith, CBE Gillian Susan Allan a Holding Company Director West Clandon, Surrey David Ian Allan Citizen and Stationer & Newspaper Maker Kevin Hendy Dewey Citizen and Stationer & Newspaper Maker Jill Caroline Eden-French Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex a Lawyer Barbara Janet Connell Citizen and Scrivener Elaine Davis Citizen and Painter-Stainer Peter Richard Eden an Insurance Broker Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex Barbara Janet Connell Citizen and Scrivener Elaine Davis Citizen and Painter-Stainer **Becky Thoseby** a Civil Servant Bermondsey, London

Citizen and Broderer

Colin Anthony Hart

4

Stephen Richard Lewin Citizen and Broderer

Neil Alexander Hocking a Local Government Officer

John Douglas Chapman, CC Citizen and Common

Councilman

Citizen and Butcher Nicholas John Anstee, Ald.

Neil Gordon Barclay a Music Teacher Poplar, London

Dorothy Newlands of Lauriston Citizen and Basketmaker

Citizen and Glover Ann-Marie Jefferys

Richard Edward Melhuish an Environmental

Engineering Company Chairman

Jan Charles Wichtowski Citizen and Cutler

Susan Mary Wichtowski Citizen and Framework Knitter

Charles William Doe a Metal Processing Company Chichester, West Sussex

East Grinstead, West Sussex

Chilworth, Nr. Guildford, Surrey

Purley, Surrey

Harold Ebenezer Piggott Citizen and Basketmaker Paul Stephen Hollebone Citizen and Chartered

Accountant

Adrian Malcolm Robertson Southwark, London a Manufacturing Systems

Consultant, retired Citizen and Wheelwright Deputy Keith David Forbes

Bottomley Christopher Michael Hayward, CC Citizen and Pattenmaker

Andrew Clifford Parton an Account Manager, retired Edgbaston, Birmingham

Deputy Keith David Forbes Citizen and Wheelwright

Bottomley Christopher Michael Hayward, CC Citizen and Pattenmaker

Margaret Joy Mayston, AM an Academic Little Venice, London

Neil Graham Morgan Redcliffe Citizen and Basketmaker Citizen and World Trader Pauline Mavyn Lyle-Smith

David Ralph Potts, MBE a Regular Army Officer, Wapping, London

retired Martin John Edward Bunn Citizen and Coach Maker &

Coach Harness Maker

Robert Slobodan Lakic Citizen and Glover

Paul Lawrence Murphy a Public Servant

Citizen and Poulter Ian Stewart Wilson Donald Howard Coombe, MBE Citizen and Poulter

Robert Michael John Cross an Officer Cadet Wimbledon, London

Alan Roy Willis Citizen and Baker David William Bentley Citizen and Baker

Shane Mark O'Neill a Chartered Surveyor Northfields, London

Citizen and Needlemaker Professor George Cooper **Borthwick**

Steven Cooper Borthwick Citizen and Needlemaker

Bernard Nicholas John Barker a Musician Streatham, London Citizen and Painter-Stainer Julian Edward Christian Briant

Jonathan James Hugh Barnes

Citizen and Carpenter

Yallowley

Michael Thomas Wilkins Marianne Bernadette Fredericks,

a Security Officer Citizen and Baker

Belvedere, Kent

Gordon Warwick Haines

Lt Col. Michael Robert Allison,

Alan Leslie Warman Diane Irene Warman a Chartered Electrical Engineer, retired Citizen and Clockmaker Citizen and Clockmaker

Citizen and Needlemaker

North Somerset

James Edward Harry Took

William Frederick Payne Gareth Wynford Moore

a Service Manager, retired

Citizen and Joiner Citizen and Joiner

Beccles, Suffolk

lain Warwick Bray Martin Victor Edwards

George Niblett

an Admissions Officer Citizen and International Banker

Citizen and Mason

Folkestone, Kent

Subrina Hossain

a Television Company Director

Ilford, Essex

Ann-Marie Jefferys Anne Elizabeth Holden Citizen and Glover Citizen and Basketmaker

Robertas Katilius

Timothy Russell Hailes, Ald., JP Deputy Thomas Sleigh

a Postgraduate Student

Citizen and International Banker

Citizen and Common Councilman

Greenwich, London

Benjamin Mackay Mielke

Timothy Russell Hailes, Ald., JP Rev. Canon David Parrott

a Veterinarian

Citizen and International Banker

Citizen and Distiller

Essendon, Hertfordshire

Rhiannon Elizabeth Leary

Emma Edhem, Ald. Wendy Mead, OBE, CC a Local Government Officer

Citizen and Woolman Citizen and Glover

Hertford, Hertfordshire

Simon Stuart Cross

Alderman Timothy McNally Nicholas Brudenell Doherty

a Borough Councillor Citizen and Glazier

Citizen and Gunmaker

Citizen and Art Scholar

Hampshire

Anthony Joseph Schembri Jr.

a Professor

Douglaston, New York,

Justin Giles Joseph Morin-

Carpentier

James Anthony Drabble

Citizen and Tyler & Bricklayer

United States of America

David Michael Youkee

Adarsh Kumar Sharma

a Local Government Officer

Citizen and Chartered

Accountant

Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire

Michael Peter Cawston

Citizen and Tyler & Bricklayer

Kevin John Sullivan Graham John Peacock Richard Eaglesfield Floyd a Building Supervisor Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Basketmaker Hornchurch, Essex

Ilford, Essex

Karolis Bagdonas

a Cleaning and Maintenance

Page 5

Manager	
Citizen and Loriner	
Citizen and Basketmaker	
a Security Officer	Newham, London
Citizen and Basketmaker	
a Civil Engineer	Upminster, Essex
Citizen and Loriner	
Citizen and Loriner	
a Clergyman	Oxford, Oxfordshire
Citizen and Solicitor	
Citizen and Barber	
a University Student	Cornwall
Citizen and Basketmaker	
a Marine Engineer, retired	Eltham, London
Citizen and Spectacle Maker	
Citizen and Builders Merchant	
a Neuropsychologist	Novosibirsk, Russia
Citizen and Loriner	
Drawer	
a Police Officer	Chelmsford, Essex
Citizen and Wheelwright	
a Police Officer	Maldon, Essex
Citizen and Tyler and Bricklayer	
Citizen and Wheelwright	
a Bank Manager	Braintree, Essex
Citizen and Glover	
Citizen and Basketmaker	
The Ambassador of Slovakia	Hampstead, London
Citizen and Woolman	
Citizen and Pewterer	
a Musician	Shenley, Hertfordshire
Citizen and Draper	
Citizen and Skinner	
on Event Communication	Du akin ahamatahira
	Buckinghamshire
	Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Basketmaker a Security Officer Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Basketmaker a Civil Engineer Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Solicitor Citizen and Barber a University Student Citizen and Glover Citizen and Basketmaker a Marine Engineer, retired Citizen and Spectacle Maker Citizen and Builders Merchant a Neuropsychologist Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer a Police Officer Citizen and Tyler and Bricklayer Citizen and Wheelwright a Police Officer Citizen and Wheelwright a Bank Manager Citizen and Glover Citizen and Basketmaker The Ambassador of Slovakia Citizen and Pewterer a Musician Citizen and Draper

an Analyst Programmer Citizen and Wheelwright Edenbridge, Kent

Jody Alan Townsend *Gordon William Sinclair Davie*

Christopher Anthony Verey

Dadson

Citizen and Glover

Wo Christopher Robert Arger

a Regular Army Non-Commissioned Officer

Mark John Herbage James Richard Martin Citizen and Cook Citizen and Baker Norwich, Norfolk

Christine Margaret

Hawthorne

Andrew Boggis Dr Elisabeth M Goodwin a Dyslexia Tutor, retired

Epping, Essex

Citizen and Skinner Citizen and Educator

Paul James Brinck Edward Arthur Jackson David John Borchardt Brinck a Bank Manager, retired Citizen and Wheelwright Citizen and Wheelwright

Fleet, Hampshire

Zulkaif Riaz

Timothy Russell Hailes, Ald., JP Fiona Josephine Adler

a Student Citizen and International Banker Citizen and Tobacco Pipe Maker Southall, Middlesex

Steven Frank Olding

a Printing Company Director, retired

South Norwood, London

John Gavin

Citizen and Information **Technologist**

Thomas William Robert Lee

Citizen and Barber

Islington, London

Alexander Luc Norman Appelmans

Martin Klocek Henryk Stanislaw Klocek

Malvin Sharpless

a PhD Researcher Citizen and Loriner

Citizen and Loriner

an Electrical Sales Manager,

Richard John Bradburn Citizen and Musician Ovlan Clement Redmond Citizen and Butcher

Hull, Yorkshire

Hannah Beth Jackson

Brian Andrew Kay, OBE, TD, DL Thomas Lloyd Barker

a Farmer

Citizen and Furniture Maker

Citizen and Farrier

Citizen and Solicitor

Citizen and Pattenmaker

Croglin, Cumbria

James Marcus Stuttard

Robert David Frazer Barnes Deputy Catherine Sidony McGuinness

a Banker

Haslemere, Surrey

David Douglas Macdonald

Timothy Russell Hailes, Ald., JP Christopher Michael Hayward, CC a Property General Manager Citizen and International Banker

Citizen and International Banker

Haslingfield, Cambridgeshire

Michael James Edward Shaw

Polak

Susan Pamela Webb Sir Andrew Charles Parmley, Ald. a Barrister

Farringdon, London

Ann Marie Lonergan

Citizen and Musician

a Furniture Company

Managing Director

Ealing, London

Dr Anthony Guy Smart, MBE Elizabeth Frances Shaw

Ross Maxwell McEwan a Bank Chief Executive Putney, London Officer Vincent Thomas Keaveny, Ald. & Citizen and Solicitor Sheriff Deputy Catherine Sidony Citizen and Solicitor McGuinness Sadia Brigitte Ricke a Investment Banking Ceo Kensington, London Deputy Catherine Sidony Citizen and Solicitor **McGuinness** The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor **Christiano Arnhold Simoes** an Entrepreneur Zurich, Switzerland John Alexander Smail Citizen and Distiller Dorothy Newlands of Lauriston Citizen and Basketmaker Julie Anne Etchingham a Journalist East Sheen, London Alison Jane Gowman, Ald. Citizen and Glover Deputy Catherine Sidony Citizen and Solicitor **McGuinness** The Rt. Hon. Michael Gove, a Member of Parliament West Kensington, London MP Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Solicitor Deputy Catherine Sidony McGuinness The Rt. Hon. David Michael a Member of Parliament Chorleywood, Hertfordshire Gauke, MP The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor Christopher Michael Hayward, CC Citizen and Pattenmaker Amanda Jane Bradshaw a Service Innovation Leader Wellingborough, Northamptonshire David John Bradshaw, CC Citizen and Common Councilman Lesley Faith Bradshaw Citizen and Cooper **Anthony David James** a Pension Consultant Northampton, **Bradshaw** Northamptonshire David John Bradshaw, CC Citizen and Common Councilman Lesley Faith Bradshaw Citizen and Cooper Ana Patricia Botin-Sanz De a Bank Group Executive Madrid, Spain Sautuola Y O'Shea Chairman The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor Deputy Catherine Sidony Citizen and Solicitor **McGuinness** Ms Xin Chen a Banker Finchley, London Mei Sim Lai Citizen and Horner Alastair John Naisbitt King, Ald. Citizen and Blacksmith Palmerston North, Michael Scott Raleigh a Business Manager New Zealand Jonathan Martin Averns Citizen and Fletcher

Citizen and Coachmaker &

Paul Malcolm Kennerley, RD

Coach and Harness Maker

The Hon. Hannah Mary a Charity Director Little Venice, London

Rothschild

Graham David Packham Citizen and Upholder Wendy Marilyn Hyde Citizen and World Trader

Jennette Arnold, OBE a Member of the London Hackney, London

Assembly

Deputy Catherine Sidony Citizen and Solicitor

McGuinness

Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst Citizen and Grocer

Read.

A Member spoke in relation to the award of the Freedom to political figures and the recent number which had been awarded to current of former Ministers and senior figures within the Government, suggesting that care should be taken to ensure a balanced position was taken.

Resolved – That this Court doth hereby assent to the admission of the said persons to the Freedom of this City by redemption upon the terms and in the manner mentioned in the several Resolutions of this Court, and it is hereby ordered that the Chamberlain do admit them severally to their Freedom accordingly.

10. Legislation

The Court received a report on measures introduced by Parliament which might have an effect on the services provided by the City Corporation as follows:-

Statutory Instruments

Date in force 6th April 2020

The Animal Welfare (Licensing of Activities Involving Animals) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2019 S.I. No. 1093

The Regulations will prohibit the commercial sale of puppies and kittens aged under six months, which were not bred by the licence holder. The Regulations are of interest to the Common Council owing to its responsibility for the enforcement of animal welfare legislation across London.

(The text of the measures and the explanatory notes may be obtained from the Remembrancer's Office.)

Read.

11. Ballot Results

The Court proceeded to consider appointments to the following Committees and Outside Bodies:-

(A) One Member on the **Port Health and Environmental Services Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring April 2020.

Nominations received:-

John Ernest Edwards

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared John Edwards to be appointed to the Port Health and Environmental Services Committee.

(B) Three Members on the **Markets Committee**, for the balance of terms expiring in April 2020.

Nominations received:-

Deputy Philip Woodhouse

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Deputy Philip Woodhouse to be appointed to the Markets Committee.

(C) One Member on the **City Bridge Trust Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring April 2021.

Nominations received:-

Deputy Richard David Regan, O.B.E.

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Deputy Richard Regan to be appointed to the City Bridge Trust Committee.

(D) One Member on the **Board of Governors of the Museum of London**, for a term expiring in September 2023.

Nominations received:-

Randall Keith Anderson Mark Bostock Tijs Broeke John Petrie Jeremy Lewis Simons

Read.

The Court proceeded, in accordance with Standing Order No.10, to ballot on the foregoing contested vacancies.

The Lord Mayor appointed the Chief Commoner and the Chairman of the Finance Committee, or their representatives, to be the scrutineers of the ballots.

Resolved – That the votes be counted at the conclusion of the Court and the results printed in the Summons for the next meeting.

12. Questions

Broeke, T., to the Chair of Policy & Resources

Support for EU nationals in the City

Tijs Broeke asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee regarding the provision of advice and support services for EU nationals living and working in the City.

In response, the Chair agreed that it was unacceptable for there to be any uncertainty about the rights of EU citizens living in the UK and noted that the City Corporation had continued to highlight to Government the importance of access to talent after Brexit, in both public and private, over the past three years. She observed that, after Brexit, it was clear the UK required an immigration system that would allow businesses to access the people they need and noted that the global mix of people was a crucial part of London's position as a global financial centre.

The Chair noted the assistance being provided by the City Corporation to residents who were EU citizens, with staff at Barbican and Community Libraries assisting people with making online applications for UK visas and citizenship via library computers and library staff assisting EU citizens with registering for Settled Status. City Corporation employees had been consistently advised and offered assistance to make sure that all were aware of the Settled Status scheme, and the City had commissioned adverts, newsletters and used a series of media interventions to warn small and medium enterprises of the need to prepare for a No Deal Brexit. These efforts would continue and intensify in the lead up to 31 October.

Replying to a supplementary question from Tijs Broeke concerning the electoral rights of EU nationals after Brexit, the Chair noted that the Honourable Member had now been provided with some detail on the technical law regarding the electoral rights of EU nationals in Common Council elections. She added that it is was her understanding that the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 had not altered the position of 'relevant citizens of the Union' in the domestic electoral law governing candidature and voting and, unless Parliament legislated to remove this reference from the provisions relating to voting eligibility and qualification, EU citizens would continue to be able to vote and hold office, both in local councils and the Common Council.

City of London School for Girls Proposed Expansion

Bostock, M., to the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls Mark Bostock asked a question of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls concerning the future of the City of London School for Girls within the Barbican Estate, asking whether the proposed expansion within the Estate could be reconsidered and if thought could be given to a long-term expansion strategy outside the Barbican Estate.

Responding, the Chairman outlined the rationale and requirement for the expansion proposals and assured Members that significant thought had been given to them, with the Board's firm belief being that they represented the best way forward in continuing to deliver a world-class education to pupils. He emphasised that the School valued its place at the heart of the Barbican Estate deeply and, to that end, had worked closely with the local community in developing its plans for expansion, including regular meetings with Barbican House representatives. The School was currently undertaking an extensive consultation process, the findings of which would be considered fully prior to the development of a preferred scheme. This

would be subject to a full and robust planning application process, following which, it would be for the usual committees to consider the proposals, including the Planning & Transportation Committee, in the normal way.

Mark Bostock asked a supplementary question, in which he drew the Chairman's attention to a petition with over 3000 signatures to save the Barbican Estate from harmful development arising from the School, seeking assurances any further developments would take place outside of the Barbican Estate. Responding, the Chairman advised that the Board had considered a number of options, within and without the Estate, and that the preferred option was that which was currently being developed. He stressed that the School had long been part of the fabric of the Barbican Estate and had worked hard to be good neighbour; whilst the School had changed over the years, it was not the only element within the Estate which had done so. He observed that the Estate was a living community which needed to continually evolve to meet needs of all stakeholders. In coming to a view on any proposals, the planners would inevitably balance any perceived harm with the anticipated benefits that would accrue from any expansion – as would the Planning & Transportation Committee. The Chairman suggested that it would be appropriate to leave such judgments to them, rather than speculate prior to proposals being submitted.

In reply to a further supplementary question from William Pimlott concerning past undertakings and the need to develop a long-term plan for the School outside of the Barbican Estate, the Chairman referred to the Chair of Policy & Resources' comments at the last meeting of the Court, advising that he too had seen no evidence of such an undertaking. He also stated that he did not believe it was appropriate to make such promises, nor would he seek to do so; however, he assured Honourable Members that the School would always strive to be as good a neighbour as possible whilst meeting the needs of its pupils, and would continue to seek to engage with residents as far as possible to minimise any potential conflict between the two.

In response to a further supplementary question from Mary Durcan, which sought clarity as to the existence of long-term plans for the School and asked for them to be shared with residents and the Court, the Chairman advised that the current five-year plan was now coming to an end and that a new plan was now beginning to be developed. He also took the opportunity to emphasise that the Board was committed to working with the local community.

Replying to a further supplementary question from Jeremy Mayhew, which urged the Chairman to reconsider the proposals in the light of significant opposition from residents and previous undertakings made, the Chairman reiterated that all views were currently being collated as part of the public consultation process and would be considered when the Board moved forward to the planning process.

Newman, B.P., C.B.E.; Bradshaw, D.J., Deputy *Motion* – That, pursuant to Standing Order 2, Standing Order 13(6) be suspended, to facilitate continued debate.

Upon the Motion being put, the Lord Mayor declared it to be lost.

Mooney, B.D.F., to the Chair of Policy & Resources

Smithfield Market and Markets Consolidation Programme

Deputy Brian Mooney asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee seeking an update in respect of negotiations with the Smithfield Market Tenants' Association as part of the Markets Consolidation Programme.

Responding, the Chair advised that the City Corporation had been working closely with traders at the three existing market sites – Billingsgate, New Spitalfields and Smithfield – about the possibility of relocating to the Barking Reach site, in the London Borough of Dagenham and Redbridge. This was an exciting opportunity to design a market that was fit for the future and met the needs of traders, suppliers and customers. She noted that negotiations across the three sites were commercially sensitive but that the City continued to work constructively with traders and associations at all three sites.

In relation to Smithfield in particular, given the complex nature of the relocation process, whilst the discussions had been somewhat more protracted than the City might have ideally wished for, the City was optimistic about reaching a satisfactory conclusion in the near future. However, she was clear that any compensation would need to be fair and equitable and of a level that the City could afford.

Energy Efficiency in City Buildings

Hughes-Penney, R.C., to the Chair of Planning & Transportation Alderman Robert Hughes-Penney asked a question of the Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee concerning the use of air conditioning and heating in relation to energy efficiency and building design.

Replying, the Chair advised that the City of London Local Plan 2015 set ambitious targets for delivering a greener, more energy efficient City and that planning policies meant that new buildings were required to demonstrate the highest feasible and viable sustainability standards in their design, construction, operation and end of life phases of development. The sustainability credentials of buildings were assessed using the BREEAM standard and new buildings in the City had to meet BREEAM excellent or outstanding, with assessments carried out at both the design stage and after construction. The Chair noted that a number of new buildings in the City were seen as exemplars of sustainability; for instance, the Bloomberg development was recognised as one of the most sustainable office buildings in the world.

The Chair also outlined planning policy requirements associated with tough carbon reduction targets and the sustainable build and use of new developments, as well as projects associated with making the City a greener and more attractive place to live and work, such as the Aldgate Square development and the delivery of green roofs.

Responding to a supplementary question from Deputy Brian Mooney, the Chair advised that the City Corporation was recognised as having bold and radical policies in respect of pedestrianisation, with the new Transport Strategy setting out ambitious proposals to put walking first and make City streets more attractive and safer places to be. Amongst other measures, the Strategy included an aim to achieve pedestrian priority on half of all streets in the square mile, including through the use of access restrictions and timed pedestrianisation.

Following a further supplementary question from Deputy Tom Sleigh, the Chair welcomed the positive steps being taken by the Property Investment Board in looking at the implementation of higher sustainability standards across its property portfolio, including the recent appointment of a sustainability expert. He agreed that this was a welcome development in demonstrating the City Corporation's commitment across the piece to sustainability and green issues.

Support for Ship Finance

Barrow, D., to the Chair of Policy & Resources

Doug Barrow asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee concerning support for the UK's position in relation to ship finance and the recommendations of the recently published "Catching the Wave" research report.

In reply, the Chair the commended the research report, noting it was vital in showing the importance of the sector to the UK economy and action needed to secure the current position and ensure the UK was globally competitive for the future. She observed that the UK was the global leader for maritime business services, both in terms of market share and in terms of the depth and complexity of services it offered, which tied into other work the City fed into, such as the Professional Business Services Council. The Chair was pleased to note that a number of the core recommendations around strengthening the sector aligned with the City's corporate priorities, including promoting the UK as a centre for Green Finance and as a hub for RMB internationalisation, and ensuring that the City and the UK post Brexit remained open and attractive to global talent.

The Chair advised the Court that the City Corporation would continue to work with the industry and Government in these areas to promote opportunities for maritime and shipping and would look for further opportunities to enhance the international promotion of the industry through its global engagement programmes.

13. Motions

Regan, R.D.R., , O.B.E., Deputy; Hoffman, T., M.B.E., Deputy

Cassidy, M.J., C.B.E., Deputy; Hoffman, T., M.B.E., Deputy

Christian, D.G.; Langley, S., O.B.E., Alderwoman

- (A) Resolved That John Ernest Edwards be appointed to the Markets Committee for the Ward of Farringdon Within, in the room of Thomas Anderson (who is no longer on the Court), and also to the Planning and Transportation Committee, in the room of Karina Dostalova.
- (B) Resolved That Dawn Linsey Wright be appointed to the Markets Committee and to the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee, for the Ward of Coleman Street, in the room of Stuart Fraser (who is no longer on the Court).
- (C) Motion "That this Honourable Court welcomes the development of a Sport & Physical Activity Strategy for the City of London Corporation which will enhance the City's contribution to London's cultural and community life; build on the existing work of our open spaces, schools, and academies; and support our commitment to the health and wellbeing of City residents, workers, and visitors.

In guiding Officers as they draft the Corporation's strategic vision for sport and physical activity, the Court believes that:

Sport inspires competitors to achieve the best they can, and celebrates both

winning and taking part;

- Sport and physical activity enables participants of all ages to live healthier more active lives;
- Sport unifies society: it is the ultimate social inclusion with participants and spectators drawn together from all backgrounds, helping to develop more cohesive communities;
- Sport produces significant social return, for example by improving mental health and reducing crime, including diverting young people away from gang and knife crime:
- Sport teaches fusion skills which enhance employability, such as teamwork and resilience;
- Sport contributes to London's global brand in offering a comprehensive attractive package to businesses and their staff in a way few other cities can;
- Sport enhances the Corporation's convening power by providing networking opportunities to bring people together informally.

Moreover, this Court notes the wide engagement of the City's business community in sport as commercial partners, as well as supporting staff and community sport activities, using both to strengthen brand and build bridges with domestic and international customers and stakeholders.

It further notes the importance that the Mayor of London and agencies such as London & Partners place on sport, both in growing participation and in bringing more elite competitions to the capital.

This Court therefore commits the Corporation to develop a comprehensive and unified Sport & Physical Activity Strategy which:

- a) supports the development and improvement of our existing sport and physical activity facilities, including those in our open spaces, and their use for both widening participation and hosting elite competitions;
- b) fully involves the City's schools and academies as part of their educational and co-curricular provision;
- supports London bids for international elite sport tournaments in accordance with Government, UK Sport and the Mayor of London's priorities, including provision of facilities and hospitality both during bids and once an event has been successfully secured;
- d) as part of our regional strategy, provides appropriate support for hosting bids submitted by other parts of the United Kingdom (where they are not in competition with London);
- e) engages City residents and workers, as well as students in our schools and academies and residents in Corporation housing, in sport and

physical activity programmes and events designed to increase participation and improve health and wellbeing;

- f) promotes diversity and inclusion in sport, including women and girls, disability, BAME and LGBTQ+ involvement; and
- g) works alongside the Department for Digital, Culture, Media, & Sport; UK Sport; Sport England; the Sport & Recreation Alliance; London Sport; the Greater London Authority; London Councils; international and national sport federations; and local professional and amateur sports clubs.

In developing the new Strategy, this Court also requests:

i.the Policy and Resources Committee to put in place:

- (a) appropriate Member-level governance arrangements for strategic oversight of the Corporation's sport activities and sport engagement; and,
- (b) being mindful of the ongoing Fundamental Review, appropriate resource allocation for sport, including drawing together existing resources into one identifiable budget;

ii.the Establishment Committee to ensure that adequate management and operational structures are in place to oversee the delivery of the Strategy."

Dominic Christian spoke to introduce the Motion, following which Alderwoman Susan Langley, the seconder of the Motion, spoke in support. Several other Members also spoke to commend the Motion. The Chair of Policy, replying, took the opportunity to support the Motion and to outline the activity already being supported and the collaboration in place with others. She noted that a draft Strategy was currently being produced and that Members would have the opportunity to scrutinise it in the autumn, ensuring that appropriate resource and Member oversight was in place following the Fundamental Review.

Broeke, T; Sleigh, T., Deputy

Motion – That, pursuant to Standing Order 11(9), the Question be now put.

Upon the Motion being put, the Lord Mayor declared it to be carried.

Upon the substantive Motion being put, the Lord Mayor declared it to be carried.

Resolved – "That this Honourable Court welcomes the development of a Sport & Physical Activity Strategy for the City of London Corporation which will enhance the City's contribution to London's cultural and community life; build on the existing work of our open spaces, schools, and academies; and support our commitment to the health and wellbeing of City residents, workers, and visitors.

In guiding Officers as they draft the Corporation's strategic vision for sport and

physical activity, the Court believes that:

- Sport inspires competitors to achieve the best they can, and celebrates both winning and taking part;
- Sport and physical activity enables participants of all ages to live healthier more active lives;
- Sport unifies society: it is the ultimate social inclusion with participants and spectators drawn together from all backgrounds, helping to develop more cohesive communities;
- Sport produces significant social return, for example by improving mental health and reducing crime, including diverting young people away from gang and knife crime;
- Sport teaches fusion skills which enhance employability, such as teamwork and resilience;
- Sport contributes to London's global brand in offering a comprehensive attractive package to businesses and their staff in a way few other cities can;
- Sport enhances the Corporation's convening power by providing networking opportunities to bring people together informally.

Moreover, this Court notes the wide engagement of the City's business community in sport as commercial partners, as well as supporting staff and community sport activities, using both to strengthen brand and build bridges with domestic and international customers and stakeholders.

It further notes the importance that the Mayor of London and agencies such as London & Partners place on sport, both in growing participation and in bringing more elite competitions to the capital.

This Court therefore commits the Corporation to develop a comprehensive and unified Sport & Physical Activity Strategy which:

- a) supports the development and improvement of our existing sport and physical activity facilities, including those in our open spaces, and their use for both widening participation and hosting elite competitions;
- b) fully involves the City's schools and academies as part of their educational and co-curricular provision:
- c) supports London bids for international elite sport tournaments in accordance with Government, UK Sport and the Mayor of London's priorities, including provision of facilities and hospitality both during bids and once an event has been successfully secured;
- d) as part of our regional strategy, provides appropriate support for hosting bids submitted by other parts of the United Kingdom (where they are not in competition with London);

- e) engages City residents and workers, as well as students in our schools and academies and residents in Corporation housing, in sport and physical activity programmes and events designed to increase participation and improve health and wellbeing;
- f) promotes diversity and inclusion in sport, including women and girls, disability, BAME and LGBTQ+ involvement; and
- g) works alongside the Department for Digital, Culture, Media, & Sport; UK Sport; Sport England; the Sport & Recreation Alliance; London Sport; the Greater London Authority; London Councils; international and national sport federations; and local professional and amateur sports clubs.

In developing the new Strategy, this Court also requests:

i.the Policy and Resources Committee to put in place:

- (a) appropriate Member-level governance arrangements for strategic oversight of the Corporation's sport activities and sport engagement; and,
- (b) being mindful of the ongoing Fundamental Review, appropriate resource allocation for sport, including drawing together existing resources into one identifiable budget;
- ii. the Establishment Committee to ensure that adequate management and operational structures are in place to oversee the delivery of the Strategy.

14. Awards and Prizes

There was no report.

15. POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)

4 July 2019

Standing Orders: Light Touch Review

Over recent years, a number of *ad hoc* amendments had been made to the City Corporation's Standing Orders. It had become apparent that a small number of inconsistencies had crept in over time which needed to be corrected; in addition, a handful of legislative changes which had come into force in recent years were not wholly reflected within the latest document.

A light-touch review had, therefore, been undertaken to correct any inconsistencies in the Standing Orders, to provide further clarity where necessary, and to bring them up to date with legislation.

As the Committee responsible for the review and co-ordination of the governance of the City of London Corporation, including its committees, standing orders and outside bodies scheme, the Policy and Resources Committee now **recommended** the Court to approve the amended document accordingly.

Scott, J.G.S., J.P.; Lord, C.E., O.B.E, J.P., Deputy.

Amendment – That Standing Order 14(1) be amended to read "a Member demanding a Division must stand for that purpose (if able to do so). A Division will not be allowed unless another 11 Members (i.e. 12 in total) stand in their places (if able to do so) to support the demand."

Resolved – That the proposed changes to Standing Orders be approved as set out at Appendix 1, subject to the amendment passed in respect of Standing Order 14(1).

16. HOSPITALITY WORKING PARTY OF THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

(Deputy Tom Hoffman, M.B.E., Chief Commoner)

16 July 2019

(A) 71st (City of London) Yeomanry Signal Regiment March and Reception The 71st (City of London) Yeomanry Signal Regiment is a reserve regiment of the Royal Corps of Signals. The Regiment was granted Privileged Status in March 2018 in recognition of their long-standing association with the City of London. The Regiment was planning a Service of Thanksgiving in January 2020 at St Andrew's Holborn, following which, it wished to exercise its right to march through the City with "drums beating, flags flying and bayonets fixed", culminating in Guildhall Yard.

It was **recommended** that hospitality be granted for a lunchtime reception for the 71st (City of London) Yeomanry Signal Regiment following the march, with arrangements to be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash and within the agreed parameters.

It was asked if, in future, applications for hospitality presented to the Court could include a section setting out how they aligned with the Corporate Plan. Following discussion, it was noted that this was provided within the reports to the Hospitality Working Party and the Chief Commoner advised that this could certainly be incorporated within future submissions.

Resolved – That hospitality be granted for a lunchtime reception for the 71st (City of London) Yeomanry Signal Regiment following the march, with arrangements to be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash and within the agreed parameters.

(B) William Cecil, 1st Baron Burghley lecture and reception

William Cecil, Lord Burghley (1520-1598), was the chief minister of Elizabeth I and the leading political and diplomatic figure for most of her reign. He had numerous civic, commercial and political connections with the City.

To mark the 500th anniversary of William Cecil's birth, it was proposed that the City Corporation, in conjunction with Gresham College and the Lord Burghley 500 Foundation, host a lecture on the City of London and Elizabethan Court, followed by an early evening reception and small dinner. It was, therefore, **recommended** that hospitality be granted for a lecture, early evening reception and dinner and that arrangements are made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the

costs to be met from City's Cash and within the agreed parameters.

Resolved – That hospitality be granted for a lecture, early evening reception and dinner and that arrangements are made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash and within the agreed parameters.

17. **POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD**

(Doug Barrow)

16 May 2019

City of London Police Annual Report

The Annual Report, setting out the achievements and performance of the City of London Police over the past financial year, was submitted to the Court for information.

The Chairman introduced the item to the Court and provided a comprehensive overview of the City Police's achievements over the year, as well as a summary of the constructive challenge provided by the Police Authority Board across the period. The Chairman also took the opportunity to outline the outcomes of the London Bridge Inquest and update Members on the latest position in respect of Action Fraud.

Resolved – That the report be received.

18. FREEDOM APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

(Alderman Sir David Wootton)

30 July 2019

The Honorary Freedom

Following the passing of a motion at Court of Common Council in January 2019, the Freedom Applications Committee had commenced the process which could lead to the removal of the Honorary Freedom awarded to Aung San Suu Kyi in 2017. In accordance with this process, the Freedom Applications Committee was required to deliberate on how to proceed and had considered a way forward and now made a **recommendation** to the Court of Common Council, proposing the suspension of Aung San Suu Kyi's Honorary Freedom.

The Chairman spoke to introduce the report, explaining the rationale behind the proposals.

Munsur Ali spoke to make clear that his explicit intention throughout the process, including through the submission of his Motion in January 2019, was for the Honorary Freedom to be revoked. He observed that this had been made clear to all Members and expressed his firm belief that the Court had fully understood this when coming to its decision in January 2019. Consequently, he articulated his significant concerns that the will of the Court was not being followed.

Ruby Sayed spoke to support this position, noting that substantial debate had taken place over the past two years. The period of delay had served to demonstrate that the humanitarian crisis in Myanmar was only deteriorating and that Aung San Suu

Kyi would not speak out against the atrocities taking place. The January 2019 Motion had been clear in that it was seeking revocation; furthermore, there was no established process for suspension and, consequently, the Freedom Applications Committee was now acting outside of the Court's instructions and ultra vires, thereby undermining the Court's sovereignty.

Sayed, R.; Addv. C.K.. Amendment – That the recommendation be altered such that the word "suspended" be replaced with the word "revoked", i.e. to read "It is recommended that the Honorary Freedom awarded to Aung San Suu Kyi be revoked".

Members proceeded to debate the Amendment.

A number of Members spoke to support the Amendment, arguing that there had been no doubt when the Motion was passed in January 2019 that the intention had been to revoke the Honorary Freedom. Members expressed dismay that an issue they thought had been resolved was now back at the same place, suggesting that the clear and express will of the Court was being frustrated. The argument that Aung San Suu Kyi might not have seen or been free to reply to correspondence from the Freedom Applications Committee was refuted, with it observed that an equally valid inference was that she had received the letters and determined not to respond. Equally, it was observed that she was not under house arrest and continued to travel internationally, speaking at events. An opportunity to respond had been provided and a lengthy period of time expended on this matter; it was, therefore, now past time to take the final action.

A number of Members spoke in opposition to the Amendment, arguing that the Court had elected to commence the process to revoke the Honorary Freedom, not to revoke directly, and that the process included seeking a response in accordance with the principles of natural justice. It was suggested that this was not consistent with the suggestion that the Court had made a clear decision to revoke in January, as otherwise there would have been no point in seeking a response. Further, Members expressed a hesitancy to act with finality given the number of unknowns in relation to her ability to speak out or respond to correspondence, and the lack of any concrete evidence of complicity. Consequently, suspension was felt to be a pragmatic solution which sent a clear and strong message of condemnation, but which allowed for any new evidence emerging to be taken into account and allowed an element of latitude accordingly.

The suggestion was also made that there remained a lack of clarity around the revocation process and matters were sufficiently unclear that the report should be withdrawn, with another committee such as Policy and Resources asked to intercede.

Ruby Sayed spoke to summarise her position and urging that the will of the Court as expressed in January 2019 be acted upon, with no further prevarication. She also expressed significant qualms as to the legitimacy of suspension as an option, in the absence of any specified process.

Alderman Sir David Wootton spoke to close debate on the Amendment and summarise his position, noting that the Committee had sought to undertake its duty in considering relevant matters and deciding how to proceed in accordance with the principles of natural justice, whilst recognising the strong feelings on all sides.

Deputy Edward Lord raised a point of order, pursuant to Standing Order 11(6), which sought clarity in relation to a perceived implication in Alderman Sir David Wootton's closing remarks that Committees might not be bound to act in accordance with resolutions of the Court. The Lord Mayor clarified that the Court was, ultimately, sovereign, and that Committees were bound to follow its direction. In this instance, he ruled that the Freedom Applications Committee had acted in accordance with the resolution to commence the process to revoke the Honorary Freedom by bringing, as part of that process, a proposal for suspension to the Court. He emphasised that the Court remained, in this instance and in the generality, the final decision-maker.

Upon the Amendment being put, the Lord Mayor declared it to be lost.

A Division being demanded and granted, there appeared:-

For the Affirmative 34

COMMONERS

Abrahams, G.C.
Addy, K.C
Ameer, R.B.
Anderson, R.K.
Bastow, A.M.
Bottomley, K.D.F., Deputy
Broeke, T.
Chadwick, R.A.H., O.B.E., Deputy
Chapman, J.D.
Dostalova, K.
Dunphy, P.G.
Durcan, J.M.

Graham., T.
Harrower, G.G
Hill, C.
Knowles-Cutler, A.
Lawrence, G.A.
Lord, C.E., O.B.E., J.P., Deputy
Martinelli, P.N.
McMurtrie, A.S., J.P.
Moys. S.D.
Murphy, B.D.
Nash, J.C., O.B.E., Deputy
Packham, G.D.

Pimlott, W.
Pritchard, J.P.
Rogula, E., Deputy
Sayed, R.
Scott, J.G.S., J.P.
Thomson, J.M.D., Deputy
Tomlinson, J., Deputy
Upton, W., Q.C.
Wright, D.L.

Tellers for the affirmative – (Affirmative) Munsur Ali and Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark (Negative).

For the Negative 39

ALDERMEN

Anstee, N.J. Bowman, Sir Charles Edhem, E. Goyal, P.B., O.B.E., J.P. Howard, R.P.S. Hughes-Penney, R. Keaveny, V.T., Sheriff King, A.J.N., M.Sc. Langley, S., O.B.E. Lyons, N.S.L. Mainelli, Professor, M.R. Russell, W.A.B. Wootton, Sir David Yarrow, Sir Alan

COMMONERS

Bennett, J.A., Deputy Bensted-Smith, N.M., J.P. Cassidy, M.J., C.B.E., Deputy Edwards, J.E. Everett, K.M., Deputy Hudson, M. Hyde, W.M., Deputy Mayhew, J.P. McGuinness, C.S., Deputy Merrett, R.A., Deputy Patel, D., O.B.E. Petrie, J. Pleasance, J.L. Regan, R.D., O.B.E., Deputy de Sausmarez, H.J. Haines, C.W Hayward, C.M. Hoffman, T.,M.B.E., Deputy Mooney, B.D.F., Deputy Moss, A.M., Deputy Newman, B.P., C.B.E. Seaton, I.C.N. Simons, J.L.

Tellers for the negative – (Negative) Alderman Sir Andrew Parmley and Caroline Addy (Affirmative).

Upon the results of the Division being announced, the Lord Mayor declared the Amendment to be lost.

Upon the original Motion being put, the Lord Mayor declared it to be carried.

Resolved – That the Honorary Freedom awarded to Aung San Suu Kyi be suspended.

19. THE CITY BRIDGE TRUST COMMITTEE

(Dhruv Patel, O.B.E.)

25 July 2019

Thresholds for grant approvals under delegated powers

At its July 2019 meeting, your City Bridge Trust Committee agreed to adjust the financial thresholds within which decisions on funding recommendations could be made by officers or the Chairman and Deputy Chairman under delegated powers. This was in order to increase the time available at meetings for discussion about strategy and wider policy issues.

These thresholds were last reviewed and set in 2014. Changes to them are subject to the final approval of the Court of Common Council and it was **recommended** that the proposed amendments to the delegations be approved.

Simons, J.L.; Lord, C.E., O.B.E, J.P., Deputy. Amendment – That recommendation (ii) be altered to require consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and ensure a greater level of Member oversight.

Resolved – That that the levels of delegation in respect of the consideration of grant applications be adjusted so that:

- (i) Applications of up to £50,000 may be approved by the Chief Grants Officer & Director of City Bridge Trust (CGO).
- (ii) Applications of over £50,000 and up to £100,000 may be approved by the CGO, in consultation with the Chamberlain, Chairman, and Deputy Chairman.
- (iii) Applications of more than £100,000 are to be approved by the City Bridge Trust Committee.
- 20.

Hoffman, T., M.B.E., Deputy; Ingham Clark, R.J., Deputy Resolved – that the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business below on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

Summary of exempt items considered whilst the public were excluded:-

21. Resolved – That the non-public Minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.

22. Policy and Resources Committee and Finance Committee

The Court noted action taken under urgency procedures concerning the Markets Consolidation Programme.

23. Finance Committee

The Court:-

- a) noted action taken under urgency procedures concerning the City Corporation's borrowing arrangements; and
- b) noted action taken under urgency procedures concerning the award of a contract for business travel services.

24. **Property Investment Board**

The Court received a report advising of action taken under urgency procedures concerning the disposal of a long-term lease.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and ended at 3.23 pm

BARRADELL.

Report of the Town Clerk to be considered in conjunction with Item 8 –

The Election of Chief Commoner

To be presented on Thursday, 10th October 2019

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

To elect a Chief Commoner

The job description of the Chief Commoner can be found on the City's website: https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/about-the-city/how-we-make-decisions/Documents/Chief-Commoner-Job-Description.pdf

Two candidates, Ann Holmes and Deputy Brian Mooney, have been validly nominated in accordance with Standing Order no. 18. The candidates were invited to provide information in support of their nomination and the following submissions were received:-

Ann Holmes

For me, the Chief Commoner fulfils two roles. One is concerned with the wellbeing and efficient functioning of the Court. It involves representing and caring for members and helping them achieve the high standards expected of us. The other involves acting as an ambassador for the Corporation. In my view, the roles are equally important and I'm confident that I am well equipped for both.

The vote of thanks I received, after chairing the Barbican Residential Committee, stated that I had an 'exemplary work ethic and affable nature'. These are key qualities in a Chief Commoner. I would also stress my persistence and my ability to handle conflict calmly and constructively, whilst having zero tolerance of any form of bullying or intimidation.

I'm an experienced public speaker, and knowledgeable about the City. I've lived in Farringdon Within - the ward I represent - for almost twenty years, and am a Court Assistant of the Worshipful Company of Cordwainers.

I've served on ten Grand Committees, two of which I've chaired, and am Deputy Chairman of a third. This has given me first-hand experience of the pressure points for both members and officers. I've also served on a significant number of sub committees and working parties. I'm a trustee of our Academies Trust and have served on the governing bodies of two of our independent schools and three of our academies, one of which I chair. I already serve on the Members' Privileges Sub Committee, and the Member Development Steering Group, two of the bodies chaired by the Chief Commoner, and ones which are crucial in giving support and training to members.

I'm ready to embrace the full-time commitment required of the Chief. If elected, I would operate an open-door policy and seek to engage members in setting my priorities.

Deputy Brian Mooney

My goal as Chief Commoner is to stand up for **all** members and to promote the Court and its work to a wider public. I am increasingly concerned about the burden membership places on us; we have more committees than members. We need a balance between what we give and what is expected of us, and we need to understand more fully what we aim to achieve and to explain better what we do. With the upcoming general election, and with an uncertain outcome, this is all the more important. We need a pro-active and experienced communicator as Chief Commoner.

I do not believe any member is opposed to standards, but we should develop a more collegiate approach to upholding them. We need a lighter touch, and we need to trust our members and rely more on common sense.

I have been a member of Common Council for more than 20 years, responding to the needs of my mainly residential ward of Queenhithe and maximising my position to challenge entrenched positions and bring about change by not being afraid to ask awkward questions. I have worked tirelessly as a backbencher, particularly in Planning and Transportation, and I chaired a highly acclaimed state banquet for Irish President Michael Higgins.

After graduating from Oxford (Magdalen College), I spent 30 years as a journalist and manager with Reuters working in more than 50 countries. I was a Pulitzer nominee and an American Press Club award winner for my reporting. I speak near fluent French, Italian and Spanish and basic Polish, Hebrew, Russian, German and Swedish. Since leaving Reuters, I have worked in international PR, published six books and written in The Times, Financial Times and various magazines. I am an underwriting member of Lloyd's. My recreational pursuits include sailing, mountaineering and long-distance walking.



List of Applications for the Freedom

To be presented on Thursday, 10th October, 2019

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

Set out below is the Chamberlain's list of applicants for the Freedom of the City together with the names, etc. of those nominating them.

Xiaoyu Wang Martyn Wheatley John Caunt	an Education Services Company Chairman Citizen and Scientific Instrument Maker Citizen and Scientific Instrument Maker	Dongcheng District, Beijing, China
Juvenal Joseph Muka Shiundu Howard Andre Beber Brian John Coombe	a United Nations Official Citizen and Poulter Citizen and Poulter	Surbiton, Surrey
Jonathan James Eade Foster Stephen Nigel Mulliner Hamish Donaldson, MBE	a Chartered Surveyor Citizen and Glover Citizen and Information Technologist	Hindhead, Surrey
Stefano Potorti Simon Jon Roberts Serafino Manca	a Consultancy Director Citizen and Cook Citizen and Marketor	Wembley, London
Brett Martin Benjamin Kenneth Lewis Benjamin Richard Lionel Howroyd Price	a Car Sales Manager Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Loriner	Laindon, Basildon, Essex
Lidiia Benjamin Kenneth Lewis Benjamin Richard Lionel Howroyd Price	a Health and Beauty Spa Director Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Loriner	Laindon, Basildon, Essex
Dr Andrew Hipolito Castello- Cortes John Barnard Grantley Carpenter Alexandra Grantley Castello-Cortes	a Medical Doctor Citizen and Pavior Citizen and Pavior	Northwood, Hertfordshire
Dr Christian Philip Hollier Turner, CMG Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP. Deputy Charles Edward Lord, OBE, JP	a Diplomat Citizen and Pewterer Citizen and Broderer	Limpsfield, Surrey
Maighread Margaret Condon Simmonds Timothy Richard Coleridge Matthew Roundell Palmer	a Nurse Citizen and Grocer Citizen and Mercer	Chelsea, London

a Police Officer, retired Graham Leonard Craker, MVO Ware, Hertfordshire Alan Leslie Warman Citizen and Clockmaker Diane Irene Warman Citizen and Clockmaker **Paul John Mav** a Chartered Surveyor Royal Docks, London Martin Collins Citizen and Educator Issa Tahhan Citizen and Environmental Cleaner Joanne Marie Cresswell a Local Government Facility & Venue Dagenham, Essex Manager Norman Edward Chapman Citizen and Glover Christopher John Otter Citizen and Poulter **Christopher Peter Jeffs** Southwark, London a Barrister Dr Anne Rosemary Haire Citizen and Apothecary Alan Frederick Graeme Groom Citizen and Innholder Simon Patrick Pollock a Director of Ceremonies Battersea, London Deputy Robert James Ingham Clark Citizen and Clothworker John Petrie, CC Citizen and Draper Olivia Philomena English an Artist Manningtree, Essex Donald Howard Coombe, MBE Citizen and Poulter David Peter Coombe Citizen and Poulter **Stephen Richard Marlow** a Data Analyst Greenwich, London Martin Henry Charles Russell, TD Citizen and Farrier Roderick Edmond Forbes Morriss Citizen and Glover Richard Anthony Ralph Carman a Risk Management Operations Yateley, Hampshire Director David James Sales Citizen and Insurer Nicholas James Redgrove Citizen and Insurer **Derek John Bain** a Consultant Bothwell, Glasgow David O'Reilly Citizen and Educator Deputy Kevin Malcolm Everett Citizen and Fletcher a Student Nurse **Duncan James Lee** Ingatestone, Essex Ronald Samuel Jones. OBE Citizen and Farrier John Keith Thomas Citizen and Farriers Rebecca Hannah Lee a Corporate Banker Ingatestone, Essex

Rebecca Hannah Leea Corporate BankerIngatestone, EssexRonald Samuel Jones, OBECitizen and FarrierJohn Keith ThomasCitizen and Farriers

Sarah Charlotte Tayler a Veterinary Surgeon Frilford, Oxfordshire

Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP Citizen and Pewterer

Judith Anne Westan AuthorBridport, DorsetMark Alastair LaneCitizen and Water ConservatorKeith TozziCitizen and Water Conservator

Citizen and Distiller

Rev. Canon David Parrott

Dr Catherine Dyer Stevenson a Psychiatrist Houston, Texas, United States

Justin Giles Joseph Morin-Carpentier
James Anthony Drabble

Ar Sychiatrist

Of America

Citizen and Tyler & Bricklayer

Citizen and Art Scholar

Alexis Adam Hira Peter Michael Simon Jon Roberts

a Senior Radiographer Citizen and Scrivener Citizen and Cook

Leicestershire

Patrick John Fitzpatrick

George Henry Capon Peter Ronald Elliott

a Facilities Team Manager Citizen and Blacksmith

Citizen and Blacksmith

Gordon John Randell

Donald Howard Coombe, MBE David Peter Coombe

a Furniture Fitter, retired

Citizen and Poulter Citizen and Poulter Beckenham, Kent

Hackney, London

Anthony Neil Collard

Donald Howard Coombe, MBE Richard Howard Coombe

a Sales Director Citizen and Poulter Citizen and Poulter Haverhill, Suffolk

Thomas Adams McLaughlin

Gerald Albert George Pulman, JP Glynn Humphreys

a Project Manager

Citizen and Carman

Citizen and Basketmaker

Leighton Buzzard, Buckinghamshire

Geraldine Stephanie Bil

a Marine Engineering Company

Partner

Citizen and Educator Citizen and Carman

Pangbourne, Berkshire

Richard Leslie Springford **Susannah Clare Tarlton**

lain Reid

Graham John Peacock Richard Eaglesfield Floyd a Textile Artist

Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Basketmaker Pangbourne, Berkshire

Peter Charles Kinder

an Adhesive Manufacturing Company

Chief Executive

Citizen and Framework Knitter

Citizen and Distiller

Loughborough, Leicestershire

Hugh Victor Feldman

Derek Alfred Buswell

John Alexander Smail

an Electronic Instrumentation Director,

retired

Citizen and Arts Scholar

Citizen and Stationer & Newspapermaker

John George Stewart Scott, CC Margaret Claire Scott

a State Registered Dietician, retired

Citizen and Arts Scholar

Saffron Walden, Essex

Saffron Walden, Essex

Susan Ruth Feldman John George Stewart Scott, CC

Margaret Claire Scott

Citizen and Stationer & Newspapermaker

a Regular Army Officer Simon Andrew Walker Camberley, Surrey Citizen and Pewterer

Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP Deputy Robert Allan Merrett

Citizen and International Banker

Mary Teresa Narvell an Interior Designer, retired Belgravia, London Citizen and Blacksmith Citizen and Blacksmith

John Leslie Barber Dean Hollington

a Police Officer, retired

Andrew Charles Waddington Sunbury-on-Thames Gordon William Sinclair Davie Citizen and Wheelwright Paul Holmes Citizen and Security Professional

Daniel William Kenny Graham John Peacock Richard Eaglesfield Floyd a Training Manager Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Basketmaker West Horsley, Surrey

John Peter Histed

Christopher Tristan Churcher Sir Frank Davies. CBE a Civil Servant Citizen and Basketmaker Citizen and Basketmaker Eltham, London

Martyn Jay Holloway-Neville

Deputy Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick,

OBE

Deputy Philip Woodhouse

a Civil Servant
Citizen and Bowyer

Citizen and Grocer

Epsom, Surrey

Henry Alasdair Roberts

Alan John Roberts Neil John Mather an Accountant Citizen and Cooper Citizen and Cooper

Jersey

Hugh Douglas Roberts

Alan John Roberts Neil John Mather a Land Manager Citizen and Cooper Citizen and Cooper York, North Yorkshire

Eric Henry Buckmaster

Alan Leslie Warman Diane Irene Warman a Councillor
Citizen and Clockmaker

Hertfordshire

Dominic Crispin Dudley Coombes

Ald. Sir Andrew Charles Parmley Jonathan Patterson Shiels

a Regular Army Officer

Citizen and Joiner & Ceiler

Citizen and Clockmaker

Treknow, Cornwall

Nohaad Jari Alothmani

Martin Collins Richard Evans a Business Processing Officer

Citizen and Educator
Citizen and Educator

Citizen and Musician

Barnet

Graham Michael Hill-Howgate

Paul Frank Basson Peter Richard Cowland

Alan Robert Brumwell

Christopher James Caine

a Trade Association General Security

Citizen and Firefighter
Citizen and Firefighter

Elsenham, Essex

Peter Thomas Frederick Coyte

Composer

Citizen and Plumber

Citizen and Maker of Playing Cards

a Funeral Director and Music

Tankerton, Kent

Peter Thompson Tweddle

Gerard John Cornwallis Sweeting

Donald Harold Lyons

a Venture Capital Sourcing Agent

Citizen and Merchant Taylor

Citizen and Cooper

Chansfield, Suffolk

Melissa Frances Rose Longley

Mark lan Henderson Dr Stefan Frederick Fafinski an Investment Manager Citizen and Currier

Citizen and Information Technologist

Putney, London

Penelope Ann Fahie

Clive Albert Francis Lambert Richard John Francis Conneely

a Beauty Therapist Citizen and Carman Citizen and Carman

Paulton, Bristol

Monique St. Claire Lorraine

Conneely

Richard John Francis Conneely Clive Albert Francis Lambert a Supply Chain Consultancy Director,

retired

Citizen and Carman Citizen and Carman Bishopsworth, Bristol

William Jerome Myers

Frederick Joseph Trowman David Robert Boston a Minister of Religion Citizen and Loriner

Citizen and Gold & Silver Wvre Drawer

Gosheniky, Kentucky, USA

Michelle Mary Catherine Wall

John Gavin Guy Leppard a Nurse

Citizen and Information Technologist Citizen and Information Technologist Woodside, Croydon

Peter Adam

Norman Edward Chapman Christopher John Otter a Product and Sales Manager

Citizen and Glover Citizen and Poulter Bad Salzuflen, Germany

William James Owen

Deputy Kevin Malcolm Everett David O'Reilly a Freight Company Director

Citizen and Fletcher Citizen and Educator Sidcup, Kent

Elmaze Pireva

Rehana Banu Ameer, CC John Douglas Chapman, CC a Head of Economic and Commercial

Affairs

Citizen and Common Councillor Citizen and Common Councillor

Citizen and Chartered Accountant

Islington, London

Charles Gavin McGregor

Deputy Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick, OBE

Graham Norman Charles Ward

a Hospitality CEO, retired

Citizen and Bowyer

Fulham, London

Jennifer Ann Edmonds

Wendy Mead, OBE, CC Patricia Agnes Campfield, MBE a Nurse, retired Citizen and Glover Citizen and Wheelwright

Arundel, Sussex

Gerald Gardiner

Peter Michael Barry John Frederick Theobald-Hicks a Police Sergeant, retired Citizen and Scrivener

Epsom, Surrey

Dr Keith Thomas Dakin-White

Stephen John Sanders Steven William Tamcken a University Lecturer Citizen and Firefighter Citizen and Basketmaker

Citizen and Scrivener

Leatherhead, Surrey

Gary Allan Pettit

Ald. William Anthony Bowater Russell Hilary Ann Russell a Broker Citizen and Haberdasher Citizen and Farmer Loughton, Essex

Mary Winifred Barrow Bernard Courtney Living

Iain Reid

a Personal Assistant Citizen and Tallow Chandler Citizen and Educator

Islington, London

Jody Clinton Baker

a Clerk To The Greater London Lieutenancy Citizen and Merchant Taylor

Sir David Brewer Kt CMG CVC

Robert Michael John Benham

Christopher James Caine

Sir David Brewer, Kt., CMG CVO John Leslie Barber n Tebworth, Bedfordshire

Dean Anthony Floyd a Construction Company Managing

Director

Citizen and Plumber

Citizen and Blacksmith

Citizen and Maker of Playing Cards

Chigwell, Essex

Daniel O'Sullivan

Deputy Henry Llewellyn Michael Jones Vincent Dignam a Trades and Labour Infrastructure Chairperson

Citizen and Common Councillor

Citizen and Carman

Dollis Hill, London

H.E. Libor Secka Karina Dostalova, CC

Mark Raymond Peter Henry Delano

Wheatley, CC

a Diplomat Citizen and Marketor Citizen and Draper

Hampstead, London

His Excellency Sheikh Abdulla Bin Saoud Al-Thani

The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor Ald. Sir David Wootton, Kt.

a Banker

Qatar

Guoli Tian

The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor

a Bank Chairman

Citizen and Fletcher

Beijing, China

Deputy Catherine Sidony McGuinness

Citizen and Solicitor

Kensington, London

Maria Del Pilar Landaluce De Alvarez

Carlotta Josefina Wigglesworth Jack Wigglesworth

a Pharmacist, retired

Citizen and World Trader Citizen and World Trader

Report – City Remembrancer

Measures introduced into Parliament which may have an effect on the work and services provided by the City Corporation

To be presented on Thursday, 10th October 2019

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

Statutory Instruments The Food Information (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2019 S.I. No. 1218

Date in force 1st October 2021

The Regulations introduce a requirement for food businesses to label food, which is prepacked on the same premises from which it is sold to consumers, with a full list of ingredients with allergens emphasised. The Regulations are enforced by the Common Council acting in its capacity as a food authority.

(The text of the measures and the explanatory notes may be obtained from the Remembrancer's Office.)

This page is intentionally left blank

Motion -

by Deputy Tom Sleigh

To be presented on Thursday, 10th October 2019

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

Motion:-

Support for the Independent Judiciary and the Rule of Law

"THAT THIS HONOURABLE COURT, IN:

- a) recognising that the continued success of the City of London as a world financial and professional services centre is underpinned by a strong, trusted and independent judicial system, as expressed by the Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales in July 2018 at the Lord Mayor's Dinner for HM Judges that 'the rule of law and a well-functioning justice system underpin the prosperity and stability of the nation' and affirming that those principles and sentiments are as relevant now as they were then;
- valuing the City's deeply rooted connections with the justice system and support
 of our constitutional settlement over many centuries, including as one of only two
 guarantors of the Magna Carta of 1215 and, in more modern times, the provision
 of the Central Criminal Court, the Mayor's and City Court, and City of London
 Magistrates' Court;
- c) agreeing with the then Lord Chancellor's remarks at the Lord Mayor's Banquet in 2018 that 'together with our expert, independent judiciary, [the Rule of Law] has been and will continue to be the solid foundation for our status as a financial and legal global centre. The trust and confidence the Rule of Law provides means that businesses feel they can invest and traders can engage in contracts...';
- d) noting the unanimous decision of the United Kingdom Supreme Court on 24th September 2019 in exercising its supervisory jurisdiction over the lawfulness of acts of government, in asserting the sovereignty of Parliament and the accountability of Ministers of the Crown to Parliament as it was the Supreme Courts duty to do; and
- e) endorsing its prior decision to continue to invest in Court provision in London through the development of a new combined courts centre on Fleet Street.

EXPRESSES DEEP CONCERN:

At repeated attacks on the independent judiciary by figures in the media and public life and concurs with the remarks of the then Lord Chancellor at last year's Lord Mayor's Banquet that:

"Our institutions have become guardians of our democratic ideals. They ensure that the right checks and balances exist for us and they promote the inherent sense of fairness that exists in our country. They do not work against the people, they share power in the best interests of everyone.

That view ... is under attack. Rather than recognising the challenges of a fast-changing society require sometimes complex responses, that we live in a world of trade-offs, that easy answers are usually false answers, we have seen the rise of the simplifiers. Those grappling with complex problems are not viewed as public servants but as engaged in a conspiracy to seek to frustrate the will of the public. They are 'enemies of the people'.

In deploying this sort of language, we go to war with truth; we pour poison into our national conversation."

AND THEREFORE RESOLVES:

- To express its full and unequivocal support for the United Kingdom's independent, highly professional and experienced judiciary and their role in upholding the Rule of Law in accordance with their Oath to "do right to all manner of people after the laws and usages of this realm, without fear or favour, affection or ill will";
- To reaffirm its commitment to promoting the Rule of Law and provision of Court facilities as core elements of the Corporation's wider commitment to the national community;
- 3. To ask that the Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee writes to express our support of the judiciary and the Rule of Law to:
 - i. The President of the Supreme Court
 - ii. The Lord Chief Justice of England & Wales
 - iii. The Lord President of the Court of Session of Scotland
 - iv. The Lord Chief Justice of Northern Ireland

copied to the Attorney General, the Lord Chancellor, and the Speakers of the Houses of Commons and Lords."

Signatories to the Motion, pursuant to Standing Order 12(3):-

Deputy Tom Sleigh Alderman Tim Hailes, JP

Caroline Addy Munsur Ali

Rehana Ameer Randall Anderson
Tijs Broeke Peter Dunphy
Alderman Emma Edhem Anne Fairweather

Tracey Graham Alderman David Graves

Christopher Hill Ann Holmes

Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark

Deputy Edward Lord, OBE, JP

Alderman Gregory Jones, QC

Deputy Alastair Moss

Vivienne Littlechild, JP

Natasha Lloyd-Owen

Andrien Meyers

Ruby Sayed

Oliver Sells, QC William Upton, QC

Report – Policy and Resources Committee Governance Review

To be presented on Thursday, 10th October 2019

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

SUMMARY

At its meeting on 14 March 2019, the Policy and Resources Committee agreed to a fundamental review (FR) of the allocation of the City of London Corporation's resources being undertaken. The purpose of this review is to ascertain how resources are currently being distributed against our Corporate Plan priorities; to ensure that the City Corporation was operating within agreed priorities and that the organisation's financial plans were sustainable in the medium term.

The nature of the City Corporation's funding and service provision is diverse and good governance is essential to ensure that it is functioning effectively and remains fit for purpose. Supporting our governance structures incurs a significant part of the Corporation's expenditure. Furthermore, any changes proposed through the Fundamental Review are likely to have implications for governance. Therefore, your Policy and Resources Committee, as the Committee responsible for the review and co-ordination of the governance of the City of London Corporation, has agreed that a review of our governance arrangements should be undertaken in parallel with the FR, particularly given that a comprehensive governance review has not taken place since 2010/11.

Your Committee is conscious that some radical changes may need to be considered and hard choices made to ensure that the arrangements are efficient and effective. Acknowledging the difficulties that may be associated with doing this internally, it has, therefore, agreed that the review should be undertaken independently. Given the uniqueness of the City Corporation, as well as the administrative assistance that may be necessary, any independent person appointed would be assisted by relevant officers.

Consultation will be an important part of the process and views will be sought from all Members once the independent reviewer has begun their work, together with the use of an informal briefing session to inform the direction of travel. Suggestions from Members are also welcomed in advance of this process, by email submission to the Town Clerk's Office.

The terms of reference of the review would be "to review the governance arrangements of the organisation by undertaking a comprehensive examination of the City Corporation's Code of Corporate Governance, to ensure that the arrangements are efficient, fair, transparent and accountable".

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is **recommended** that the Court of Common Council endorse a comprehensive, independent, review of the City Corporation's governance arrangements being undertaken, with the terms of reference of the review being "to review the governance arrangements of the organisation by undertaking a comprehensive examination of the City Corporation's Code of Corporate Governance to ensure that the arrangements are efficient, fair, transparent and accountable.

MAIN REPORT

Background

- 1. At its meeting on 14 March 2019, the Policy and Resources Committee agreed to a fundamental review (FR) of the allocation of the City of London Corporation's resources being undertaken. The purpose of the review is to ascertain how resources are currently being allocated against our Corporate Plan priorities and to ensure that:-
 - spending was being undertaken in accordance with agreed priorities;
 - the City Corporation's financial plans were sustainable in the medium term;
 - action was being taken to mitigate any risks which might be associated with Government's desire for public bodies to focus on need and its plans to change current funding mechanisms to reflect this; and
 - the City Corporation remains fit for purpose in the wake of, amongst other things, Government's forthcoming spending review, fair funding review, reforms to business rate retention and a police formula funding review.
- 2. The nature of the organisation's funding and service provision is diverse and good governance is essential to ensure that it is functioning effectively and remains fit for purpose. Supporting our governance structures incurs a significant part of the Corporation's expenditure. Furthermore, any changes proposed through the Fundamental Review are likely to have implications for governance. Therefore, a number of Members suggested that a review of our governance arrangements should be undertaken in parallel with the FR.
- 3. This view was supported at recent meetings of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and Policy and Resources Committee. It was noted that it had been almost nine years since the last comprehensive review of the City Corporation's governance arrangements was undertaken and, since that time, the number of bodies forming part of the decision making structure had increased to approximately 130 committees, sub-committees and working parties, excluding some of the bi-lateral committee meetings.
- 4. In reaching their conclusion, Members were of the view that radical changes would need to be considered and that hard choices might need to be made. The difficulties associated with undertaking the review internally were acknowledged and it was, therefore, agreed that any review should be undertaken independently. Given the uniqueness of the City Corporation and the volume of information or administrative support that might be required, the independent

person appointed would be assisted by officers within the Town Clerk's department.

Proposal

- 5. The 2011 governance review was based on the City Corporation's Code of Corporate Governance i.e. the various regulatory and protocols that govern how the organisation operates and makes decisions, such as, the committee structure (constitutions, terms of reference and membership), Standing Orders, the Scheme of Delegation, Member/Officer Protocols and a number of other supporting policies. These elements of the Code will fall within the scope of the review now proposed, together with other such areas as may merit inclusion in the review.
- 6. It is also intended that the terms of reference of the review will be to "review the governance arrangements of the organisation by undertaking a comprehensive examination of the City Corporation's Code of Corporate Governance to ensure that the arrangements are efficient, fair, transparent and accountable."
- 7. Once the findings of the review have been presented, all Members of the Court will be consulted on the direction of travel and have the ability to contribute by way of an informal briefing session. Views are also welcomed in advance.

Strategic Implications and Conclusion

- 8. Effective and responsible stewardship of the City Corporation and its resources is fundamental for the organisation to continue to deliver excellent services for all its stakeholders. A fundamental review of how resources are currently being allocated against our Corporate Plan priorities is an essential part of ensuring responsible stewardship. It is important that a review such as this is examined alongside the City Corporation's current governance arrangements as the two are interrelated.
- 9. A review of the governance arrangements will ensure that how the City Corporation governs itself is appropriate, efficient and transparent. It will also enable the organisation to ensure that the best arrangements are in place; that it is operating efficiently, functioning effectively and that remains fit for purpose in the medium to long term.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 12th day of September 2019.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Deputy Catherine McGuinnessChair, Policy and Resources Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – Hospitality Working Party of the Policy and Resources Committee

Applications for Hospitality

To be presented on Thursday, 12th October 2019

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

(a) 150th Anniversary of United Synagogue

It is proposed that the City Corporation hosts a reception to mark the 150th anniversary in 2020 of the Jewish United Synagogues Act which formally established the United Synagogue as the union of British Orthodox Jewish synagogues.

There is a long association between the City and the Jewish community dating back to shortly after the Norman Conquest. The United Synagogue, which began with three synagogues in the City of London, remains the largest UK Jewish synagogue body. The London Metropolitan Archives holds one of the most important collections of Jewish archives in the country.

The event would support the following Corporate Plan Outcomes: to promote and champion diversity, inclusion and the removal of institutional barriers and structural inequalities (outcome 3a); to provide access to world-class heritage, culture and learning to people of all ages, abilities and backgrounds (outcome 3b); and to bring individuals and communities together to share experiences and promote wellbeing, mutual respect tolerance (outcome 4a).

It is **recommended** that hospitality be granted for an early evening reception to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the United Synagogue with arrangements being made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash within agreed parameters. Guests would include representatives of the Jewish community in London, and leading cultural, business and political figures.

This would be a full Court event.

(b) 101 (City of London) Engineer Regiment Reception

The 101 (City of London) Engineer Regiment (Explosive Ordnance and Search) has a long and distinguished history. Formed in 1860 as the 1st Middlesex Volunteer Engineers, the Regiment has seen service since 1882 in Egypt, South Africa, both World Wars, Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Regiment has a close connection with the City of London. In 1997 the then Lord Mayor, Sir Richard Nichols, granted permission for the Regiment to change its title to 101 (City of London) Engineer Regiment (Explosive Ordnance Disposal) to reflect its links with the City.

It is proposed that the City Corporation hosts a reception following a parade at Guildhall to mark the Regiment's return to London. Guests would include the Chief

Royal Engineer, serving members of the Regiment and their families, veterans, affiliated Livery Companies, cadets, and representatives from the City's other Privileged regiments.

The event would support the following Corporate Plan Outcomes: to promote effective progression through fulfilling education and employment (outcome 3c); to bring individuals and communities together to share experiences and promote wellbeing, mutual respect and tolerance (outcome 4a); and to advocate and facilitate greater levels of giving time, skills, knowledge, advice and money (outcome 5d).

It is **recommended** that hospitality be granted for an early evening reception following a Parade in Guildhall Yard in Summer 2020 with arrangements being made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash within agreed parameters.

This would be a full Court event.

(c) The Enchanted Interior exhibition private view.

The first of Guildhall Art Gallery's major exhibitions for 2020, *The Enchanted Interior*, will be on display from 13th March to 14th June. The exhibition will explore female empowerment during the 19th century, with a focus on Pre-Raphaelite and orientalist artists. Contemporary artworks by female artists will offer a current perspective.

It is proposed that the City Corporation hosts a private view to mark the opening of the exhibition. This will provide an opportunity to promote the exhibition, thank lenders and supporters, and highlight the Corporation's role in the City and country's cultural offering. Guests would include those who worked on and supported the exhibition, and key individuals within the arts and culture sector. It is also proposed that those awarded the City Freedom as part of the 100 Women for Freedom initiative be invited.

The event would support the following Corporate Plan Outcomes: to provide access to world-class heritage, culture and learning to people of all ages, abilities and backgrounds (outcome 3b); to promote the City, London and the UK as attractive and accessible places to live, learn, work and visit (outcome 8a); and to protect, curate and promote world-class heritage assets, cultural experiences and events (outcome 10d).

It is **recommended** that hospitality be granted for an early evening private view to mark the opening of the exhibition with arrangements being made under the auspices of the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee; the cost to be met from City's Cash within agreed parameters.

This would be a full Court event.

(d) Queen Elizabeth Prize for Engineering lunch.

The Queen Elizabeth Prize, first given in 2013, is awarded for ground-breaking innovation in engineering. It is supported by a group of leading British and international manufacturing companies and has received the personal endorsement of Her Majesty The Queen, who will present the 2019 Prize at Buckingham Palace. This year the prize has been awarded to Dr Bradford Parkinson, Professor James Spilker, Jr, Hugo

FrueHauf, and Richard Schwartz for their work on the Global Positioning System (GPS), which has transformed navigation and precision timing.

It is proposed that a lunch be hosted by the City Corporation the day prior to the award ceremony at Buckingham Palace. It is anticipated that the guest list will include, in addition to the prize winners, government officials and policy makers, chief executive officers of corporate sponsors, and prominent business, academic and industry representatives.

The event would support the following Corporate Plan outcomes: to champion access to global talent (outcome 8b) and to champion investment in relevant skills and diverse talent pools (outcome 8d).

It is **recommended** that hospitality be granted for a lunch with arrangements being made under the auspices of the Policy and Resources Committee; the cost to be met from City's Cash within agreed parameters. The host element would be the Public Relations and Economic Development Sub Committee and the Chair, Vice Chairs, Chairmen, Deputy Chairmen of a number of Committees.

All of which we present to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 18th day of September 2019

SIGNED on behalf of the Working Party.

Deputy Tom Hoffman, M.B.E.Chief Commoner and Chairman, Hospitality Working Party

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – Planning and Transportation Committee Dockless Vehicle Hire Byelaw

To be presented on Thursday, 10th October 2019

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

SUMMARY

This report seeks approval to delegate to London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee (TEC) the authority to exercise the City Corporation's byelaw-making function for the purpose of regulating dockless vehicles on the highway and/or public places by way of an addition to the existing TEC constitution, as outlined in the recommendations below.

Dockless Cycle hire schemes fall outside existing legislative frameworks and the City Corporation does not have powers to prevent dockless cycle hire schemes from operating in the City.

The lack of powers to manage dockless cycle hire operators has been recognised by TEC and Transport for London (TfL). In response, and following legal advice, TfL and London Councils have proposed a pan-London byelaw supported by an updated Dockless Vehicle Hire Operator Code of Practice.

TEC does not consider it practicable for the same Byelaw to be made independently by 33 London Local Authorities and is therefore seeking authority from all London Local Authorities and TfL to amend TEC's constitution to enable TEC to make a pan-London byelaw on the authorities' behalf.

RECOMMENDATION

Members are asked to resolve to delegate authority to London Councils' Transport and Environment Committee to exercise the following functions by way of an addition to the Part 3(D) Functions in the LC TEC agreement, inserting a new paragraph 2(c) as follows:

"(c)(i) the making of byelaws under section 235 of the Local Government Act 1972 (and, in respect of the City of London Corporation, under section 39 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1961) for the purpose of regulating dockless vehicles on the highway and/or public places (including by making it an offence for a dockless vehicle operator to cause or permit their dockless vehicle to be left on the highway or public place other than in an approved location), including taking all related steps to promote, make, amend and revoke any such byelaw.

(c)(ii) The exercise of powers under Section 1 of the Localism Act 2011 for the purposes of giving effect to (i) above, including but not limited to oversight and management of the arrangements (but excluding prosecution or other enforcement).

MAIN REPORT

Background

- 1. 'Dockless cycle hire' is a generic term for a short-term cycle hire scheme, similar to Santander Cycles, but with no on-street docking infrastructure. Dockless cycle hire has been operating in London since autumn 2017.
- 2. Dockless cycle hire schemes fall outside the existing legislative framework and the City Corporation does not have powers to prevent dockless cycle hire schemes from operating in the City.
- 3. The lack of powers to manage dockless cycle hire operators has been recognised by London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee (TEC) and Transport for London (TfL). In response, and following legal advice, TfL and London Councils have proposed a pan-London byelaw supported by an updated Dockless Vehicle Hire Operator Code of Practice.
- 4. The London Boroughs and the City Corporation have power to make byelaws under section 235 of the Local Government Act 1972 and section 39 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1961 respectively, which provide a legislative tool for boroughs to use for the 'suppression of nuisances'.
- 5. The draft byelaw text is available in Appendix 1. The byelaw defines several terms used in the draft Byelaw currently undefined in legislation (e.g. a dockless operator). It states that the byelaw applies throughout Greater London, sets out minimum safety standards for bikes, requires all bikes to be chipped to ensure their whereabouts can always be tracked, requires all bikes to be left (whether by dockless operators or their customers) only in places agreed by the relevant local authority, and makes it an offence for dockless operators to place or allow their bikes to be parked anywhere other than at a location agreed by the local authority; and sets a penalty for a dockless operator committing the offence.
- 6. TEC and TfL envisage that dockless parking bays would not be exclusive to specific operators but would be open to any byelaw-compliant dockless company wishing to use them. The byelaw has been drafted in this way because:
 - a. users want to make journeys irrespective of borough boundaries, meaning that separate borough by borough arrangements and operator selections are not conducive to encouraging cycling; and
 - b. the legislative tools used to draft the byelaw text did not necessarily provide powers for boroughs to regulate operators directly.
- 7. The drafted byelaw wording covers dockless bikes and e-bikes and could also apply to electric kick scooters or other 'micromobility' vehicles should they become legal and available for hire on London's streets.
- 8. Local issues, such as how many or how few parking places to approve and where they should be located, are all left for individual authorities to decide depending on their local circumstances. The City Corporation or a borough could also decide not to allocate parking on streets they manage, although TfL could technically still do so on the Transport for London Road Network.

- 9. TEC is looking to clarify and strengthen legal and operational aspects of the byelaw through drafting supporting byelaw text or guidance on topics including:
 - a. How enforcement will be undertaken and managed, including the amount of time given to operators to relocate inappropriately parked bikes;
 - b. The collection, management and provision of data that informs dockless customers and other highway users where they can and can't park dockless vehicles;
 - c. Proposed procedures for designating or approving parking spaces;
 - d. How boroughs may charge operators for the use of the parking spaces they make available;
 - e. How CoMoUK accreditation can play a role in further managing dockless operations in London (CoMoUK runs accreditation schemes for car club and bike share operators); and
 - f. How parking permitting, summary fines and other financial controls will be applied and issued.
- 10. TfL will also update its Dockless Bike Share Code of Practice document following further development of the above topics.
- 11. Subject to approving the delegation of powers to TEC approval of the final wording of the byelaw will be delegated to TEC membership, which includes the Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee. Amendment and revocation of the byelaw would also be delegated, but this would be a matter for consideration by the TEC membership, which includes representatives of each London authority. It is envisaged this delegation would be used in the event of adjustments being required as the scheme embedded and evolved.
- 12. Consultation with affected and interested parties on the byelaw is likely to occur in the autumn, with the aim of then making the byelaw as quickly as possible. This is dependent on the powers being delegated, amongst other things, so no fixed timetable is available.
- 13. The City Corporation's current dockless trial will conclude before the byelaw is adopted. A report will be brought to the Planning and Transportation Committee in December 2019 on the outcome of the current trial with recommendations for interim arrangements prior to the introduction of the byelaw.

Delegation of powers to TEC

14. TEC does not consider it practicable for the same Byelaw to be made independently by 33 London boroughs. The making of the pan-London byelaw requires each of the 33 London local authorities participating in the TEC joint committee arrangements to delegate the exercise of additional functions to the joint committee, which requires the TEC constitution (Governing Agreement, dated 13 December 2001 (as amended)) to be varied. Members are asked to delegate the authority to make this byelaw to TEC.

Corporate & strategic implications

- 15. Well managed dockless cycle hire in London as proposed under the new byelaw has the potential to support the Corporate Plan aims to contribute to a flourishing society, particularly promoting good health and wellbeing, and to shape outstanding environments by enhancing connectivity to the City.
- 16. The Transport Strategy (Proposal 28) sets out our approach to improving cycle hire in the Square Mile. This includes ensuring that dockless cycle operators restrict their users from parking outside designated areas and quickly remove cycles that are not parked in these areas. The byelaw would help to deliver this proposal.

Legal implications

- 17. Section 39 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1961 empowers the City Corporation to make byelaws for the good rule and government of the whole, or any part, of the City and for the suppression of nuisances therein. The confirming authority for such byelaws is the Secretary of State. The byelaws cannot duplicate existing legislation in force in the City and must be proportionate and reasonable.
- 18. Not delegating powers would impact the ability to effectively regulate dockless cycle hire London-wide and would leave each London authority seeking to address the issues piecemeal. There are currently no other legislative options to effectively regulate dockless cycle hire available or in development.
- 19. For TEC to be able to make the byelaw the LC TEC Agreement needs to be amended as local authorities' functions relating to the making of a pan-London byelaw for regulating dockless vehicles are not currently delegated as functions of LC TEC. The proposed delegation would allow LC TEC to make and promote a pan-London byelaw to regulate dockless vehicles on the highway and/or public places.
- 20. The decision to delegate the making of the proposed bylaw to the TEC would be consistent with the City Corporation's responsibilities to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic and the provision of safe and adequate parking facilities (s.122 RTRA 1984) and traffic management duty (s.16 TMA 2004).
- 21. Officers will continue to explore the potential for primary legislation to further regulate the dockless vehicle industry with TfL, London Councils and central Government. This will be the first time that byelaw making has been delegated, this being considered the most appropriate means of regulating dockless cycle parking given that primary legislation is not currently envisaged by central government.
- 22. In respect of the fines provided for (not exceeding Level 2 i.e. £500) in the event of a successful prosecution this would be a matter for the magistrate's court.

Financial implications

- 23. Dockless operators breaching the byelaw will be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 2 on the standard scale (£500), reducing the likelihood of inappropriate parking.
- 24. There will be costs associated with designating and marking out parking areas and the scope for charging for parking permits is currently being explored.

Health implications

25. Well managed dockless cycle hire has the potential to encourage active travel within central London, and potentially shift journeys from short taxi, private hire and public transport trips, with associated benefits to air quality and public health. The byelaw will support these aims.

Equality Implications

- 26. The introduction of the byelaw and allocation of dedicated parking areas will help mitigate adverse impacts for vulnerable road users (e.g. visually impaired, wheelchair users). This is consistent with the public sector equality duty.
- 27. A statement assessing the impacts of the proposal and the proportionality of the regulatory burden will be prepared prior to the presentation of the byelaw to the Minister of State. This impact assessment will include an Equality Impact Assessment.

Conclusion

- 28. Dockless cycle hire has the potential to enable more journeys to, from and within the Square Mile to be made by bike, and the City has proved to be a popular destination for users. It also represents a challenge, as users can leave bikes anywhere, potentially obstructing pavements. Introduction of the pan London byelaw will therefore allow us to manage this new type of mobility mode appropriately.
- 29. The lack of powers to manage dockless cycle hire operators has been recognised by London Councils' Transport & Environment Committee (TEC) and Transport for London. In response, and following legal advice, TfL and London Councils have proposed a pan-London byelaw supported by an updated Dockless Vehicle Hire Operator Code of Practice.
- 30. This draft byelaw is available in Appendix 1 and detailed discussions have been held on its precise wording. While these discussions have yet to conclude, the draft text will help support well-managed dockless operations in the City and across London.

Appendix

• Appendix 1: The Greater London Dockless Vehicle Hire Byelaws – Draft Byelaw

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 1st day of October 2019.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Deputy Alastair Michael MossChair, Planning and Transportation Committee

The Greater London Dockless Vehicle Hire Byelaws

Draft Bye Law - 29 July 2019

1. General Interpretation

In these byelaws:

"Docking Station" shall exclude any Sheffield Stand unless it has been designated or approved as a Dockless Parking Space

"Dockless Parking Space" shall mean a parking place for Dockless Vehicles designated by a Local Authority or Transport for London or any Public Place where a parking area for Dockless Vehicles has been approved in writing by the Local Authority or Transport for London as an area where Dockless Vehicles may be placed and made available for hire.

"Dockless Vehicle" means any transport device (whether mechanically propelled or not) which is made available to hire through a Dockless Hire Scheme and which is a pedal cycle, electrically assisted pedal cycle, or any similar class of transport device which may be lawfully used on the highway.

"Dockless Hire Scheme" means a scheme offering Dockless Vehicles for hire from a highway or other Public Place (other than a scheme offering Dockless Vehicles wholly or partly from a Docking Station constructed and installed for their use) where the contract for hire is entered into without the simultaneous physical presence of the Dockless Operator and the hirer.

"Dockless Operator" means any person offering Dockless Vehicles for hire through a Dockless Hire Scheme.

"Public Place" means an area of highway or other open land (whether or not it is fenced) under the ownership or control of a Local Authority or Transport for London.

"Local Authority" means a London Borough Council or the Common Council of the City of London.

(2) A **r**eference to:

- (a) legislation (whether primary or secondary) includes a reference to the legislation as amended, consolidated or re-enacted from time to time and, in the case of regulations, includes a reference to any regulations which replace the regulations referred to;
- (b) a "person" includes a natural person and a corporate or unincorporated body;
- (c) words in the singular include the plural and vice versa.

2. Application

These byelaws apply throughout Greater London.

3. Safe condition of Dockless Vehicles.

- (1) No Dockless Operator shall offer for hire a Dockless Vehicle unless it is safe.
- (2) In determining whether a Dockless Vehicle is safe regard shall be had to whether the Dockless Vehicle complies with, or the Dockless Operator has complied with, applicable provisions of:
 - (a) in the case of a pedal cycle, the Pedal Cycles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1983 and the Road Vehicles Lighting Regulations 1989;
 - (b) in the case of an electrically assisted pedal cycle, the Pedal Cycles (Construction and Use) Regulations 1983, the Road Vehicles Lighting Regulations 1989 and the Electrically Assisted Pedal Cycle Regulations 2015; or
 - (c) in all cases, any statutory requirements applicable to a Dockless Vehicle of that class.

4. Identification and management of Dockless Vehicles

- (1) No Dockless Operator shall offer a Dockless Vehicle for hire unless:
 - (a) it has an individually identifiable asset number visibly displayed;
 - (b) it is fitted with a device which ensures the location of the Dockless Vehicle can be identified at all times by the Dockless Operator, the local authority in whose area the Dockless vehicle is situated and Transport for London and the device is retained in operation.
- (2) No Dockless Operator shall offer a Dockless Vehicle for hire unless the hirer is prohibited from leaving the Dockless Vehicle on any highway or other Public Place other than at a Dockless Parking Space.
- (3) For the purposes of complying with paragraph 4(1)(b) and 4(2), the Dockless Operator shall make available real time location data via a publicly available application programming interface for each Dockless Vehicle that is available for hire or has been hired through its Dockless Hire Scheme.

5. Parking of Dockless Vehicles

No Dockless Operator shall cause or permit a Dockless Vehicle to be placed on any highway or Public Place other than at a Dockless Parking Space where the Dockless Operator is permitted to park or to cause or permit a Dockless Vehicle to be parked.

6. Penalty

Any person offending against these byelaws shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 2 on the standard scale.

Report – Port Health and Environmental Services Committee

Signor Favale's Marriage Portions Charity

To be presented on Thursday, 10th October 2019

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

SUMMARY

The Signor Favale Marriage Portions Charity (206949) (the Favale Charity) was established in 1882 by the Will of Italian-born Pasquale Favale, with the intent of funding dowries for 'poor, honest young women', aged 16-25, who were born in the City of London and who had recently been, or were about to be, married. The Port Health and Environmental Services Committee has, for some time, been responsible for administering the Favale Charity.

The objects of this very small charity are now considered to be outmoded and [most likely discriminatory, with the costs of administration significantly disproportionate to the funds available for distribution. Furthermore, the Charity Commission has written to the City Corporation, under its Revitalising Trusts Programme, to remind the City Corporation of its legal obligations to ensure that, as Trustee, it is administering the Charity and spending its funds effectively, or otherwise to consider transferring its funds or updating its objects.

Having considered this matter, your Port Health and Environmental Services Committee now **recommends** the Court of Common Council acting as Trustee of Favale Charity resolves to close the Charity by updating the objects to reflect those of the receiving charity, by releasing the restrictions on expenditure of the permanent endowment, and then transferring the charity's funds free of restrictions to the City of London Corporation Combined Relief of Poverty Charity (1073660), subject to Charity Commission consent. The Community and Children's Services Committee acting for the City Corporation as Trustee of that charity has subsequently resolved that it was in that charity's interests for it to take receipt of the funds on the basis proposed. The Court of Common Council is now being asked to take the necessary decisions to close the Favale Charity as it allows for the most effective use of the charitable funds.

RECOMMENDATION

The Court of Common Council, acting as Trustee of the Signor Favale's Marriage Portions Charity (206949), is recommended to:

 Resolve to exercise the applicable statutory powers contained in the Charities Act 2011 (as outlined below) to close the Signor Favale's Marriage Portions Charity (206949) by resolving to amend the Charity's objects to reflect those of the City of London Corporation Combined Relief of Poverty Charity (1073660), to release the restrictions on the permanent endowment funds held, and to transfer all the Charity's funds free of any restrictions to the City of London Corporation Combined Relief of Poverty Charity (1073660) with an expression of wish that Signor Favale's name be retained in some way in future grant-giving, subject to Charity Commission consent.

2. Authorise the Town Clerk to undertake any actions, to take any decisions and sign any documents required to make such arrangements as may be required for the closure of the Signor Favale's Marriage Portions Charity (206949) and seeking Charity Commission consent to the resolutions and transfer of its funds to the City of London Corporation Combined Relief of Poverty Charity (1073660).

Main Report

Background

1. The Signor Favale's Marriage Portions Charity (the Favale Charity) was established in 1882 by the Will of Italian-born Pasquale Favale. The modest funds, valued at approximately £720 at the time, were given in perpetuity, with the income to be applied to fund three dowries to be given to three 'poor, honest young women', aged 16-25, who were born in the City of London and who had recently been or were about to be, married. The Port Health and Environmental Services Committee has for some time been responsible for Signor Pasquale Favale's Bequest. The charity's governing documents and objects have been modified at various times, and were more substantially updated in 2000 and are now:

"to apply the yearly income of the Charity in awarding yearly Marriage Portions to poor honest women who were born within the City of London or have resided therein for the period of at least one year, and who either have been married within the period of twelve calendar months next preceding the date of award or who are about to be married".

Current Position

- 2. The Charity Commission has written to the City Corporation, under its Revitalising Trusts Programme, to remind the City Corporation of its legal obligations to ensure that, as Trustee, it is administering the Favale Charity and spending its funds effectively for the public benefit; and has advised *inter alia* that the Trustee should consider transferring the Charity's funds or updating its objects. The Charity Commission has asked to be updated after the City Corporation has given this matter further consideration.
- 3. Trustees are required to act only in the best interests of their charity. Consequently, they should consider the objects of their charity from time-to-time and to make sure that the objects are fit for purpose and provide an effective use for the charity's funds. The Favale Charity's objects are at the very least out-moded, if not in contravention of the Equality Act 2000 (gender and marital status both being protected characteristics under the Act) and it is difficult to bring the current restrictions within the relevant exceptions in that Act.

- Furthermore, the very small grants currently awarded are unlikely to have meaningful impact or provide for the effective use of the charitable funds.
- 4. The Charities Act 2011 contains powers for small charities to resolve in certain circumstances, to change the objects of the charity, release endowment and/or transfer the charity's funds to another charity and close the charity, subject to Charity Commission consent. These powers are all available for the Favale Charity.

Proposal and Financial Considerations

- 5. Your Port Health and Environmental Services Committee, having considered the matter at its 23 July 2019 meeting, has recommended to the Court of Common Council that the Charity be closed and its funds transferred, subject to Charity Commission consent, to the City of London Corporation Combined Relief of Poverty Charity (1073660) (the Relief of Poverty Charity) another charity with compatible purposes operating for the relief of need and/or poverty. The transfer is recommended to be free of restrictions but with an expression of wish that Signor Favale's name be retained in some way in future grant-giving.
- 6. On 13 September 2019, the Community and Children's Services Committee, which administers the Combined Poverty Charity for the City Corporation as Trustee, agreed to accept the transfer of funds on the terms proposed as being in the best interests of that charity. That Committee also resolved to delegate authority to the Director of the Community and Children's Services Department, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, to undertake any actions, to take any decisions and sign any documents required to effect the transfer of funds to the Combined Poverty Charity.
- 7. The Signor Favale Charity has very limited assets of approximately £15,000; less than £10,000 of which is permanent endowment capital and the balance held as unrestricted income funds. Less than £500 in income is generated each year. No 'Marriage Portions' (of £150 each) were paid in the last financial year 2018/19 (or in 2014/15, 2015/16 or 2016/17), although a number were paid in 2017/18.
- 8. The costs of administering the Charity have been borne by the City Corporation from City's Cash although this on-going subsidy is not guaranteed. In this case where City's Cash funds are being applied to meet or subsidise the costs of administering and managing the various charities for which the City Corporation is Trustee the most efficient and effective approach for the administration of the charitable funds, as is proposed through the closure of the Favale Charity, would also be in keeping with the objectives of the corporate Fundamental Review to ensure the effective use of corporate resources. Should the Charity be required to meet the costs of administration from its own funds, estimated to be at least £1,500 p.a. (excluding the costs of audit), the Charity's funds would soon be exhausted. The City Corporation has also recently agreed to undertake a Review of the City Corporation's charities, and the Signor Favale Charity would form part of that review.

- 9. In the last financial year, the Combined Poverty Charity benefited from a significant increase of approximately £370,000 in its funds, with the closure of the Corporation of London Benevolent Association and the transfer of that charity's assets to the Combined Poverty Charity. The Combined Poverty Charity's assets are now around £520,000, with approximately £110,000 held as endowment funds.
- 10. The Combined Poverty Charity's funds are administered as part of the Central Grants Programme (CGP) under the "Stronger Communities" Theme (one of four Themes set by Policy & Resources Committee), led by the Community and Children's Services Department. Grants under the CGP are administered by the Central Grants Unit co-located with the City Bridge Trust Team in the Town Clerk's Department, and oversight of the effectiveness of the CGP is overseen by the Finance Grants Scrutiny and Oversight (Finance Committee) Sub-Committee. The policy to guide how the Combined Poverty Charity's funds will be applied is currently being reviewed so the proposed transfer is timely.
- 11. Closing the Favale Charity requires the City Corporation acting by the Common Council as Trustee of the charity to take a number of decisions in the best interests of the Charity and having regard to its legal obligations as Trustee.
- 12. First, if it thinks fit, as the Charity *inter alia* had an income of less than £10,000 in its last financial year, the City Corporation, as Trustee may exercise its the power contained in s. 275 of the Charities Act 2011 (the 2011 Act) to resolve to update the Charity's objects to reflect those of the receiving charity. In order to exercise this power, the City Corporation as Trustee must be satisfied that it is expedient in the interests of the Charity for the objects to be replaced and that the new objects are, as far *as is reasonably practicable*, similar to the old objects, which is considered to be the case here and the City Corporation must seek Charity Commission consent. The objects of the Combined Poverty Charity are for the public benefit:

The relief of those in need by reason of poverty, old-age, ill-health, accident or infirmity who are either the widow, widower or child of a Freeman of the City of London or who reside in the City of London or the London Boroughs by the provision of grants, items and services or such other support as the trustee determines.

- 13. Secondly, where a charity holds permanent endowment (regardless of size), as is the case with the Favale Charity, if the City Corporation as Trustee is satisfied that the charity's (new) purposes can be carried out more effectively if the capital of the fund could be expended, the City Corporation may resolve to exercise the power contained in s. 282 of the 2011 Act to remove the restrictions on the expenditure of the capital, subject to Charity Commission consent.
- 14. Finally, as the Charity *inter alia* has an income of less than £10,000 in the last financial year, the City Corporation as Trustee may resolve to exercise the power contained in s. 268 of the 2011 Act, if it is satisfied that it is expedient and in the interest of furthering the Favale Charity's (new) purposes (i.e. having

first amended the Charity's objects using s275) to transfer all the Favale Charity's property to the Combined Poverty Charity. (ss. 267-270 of the 2011 Act), subject to Charity Commission consent.

15. These powers may be exercised in the same set of resolutions.

Conclusion

16. Your Port Health and Environmental Services and Community and Children's Services Committees have each agreed as relevant to their responsibilities as being in the best interests of the charity for which they are each responsible, to transfer the funds of the Favale Charity, free of any restrictions, to the Combined Poverty Charity (1073660), with an expression of wish that Signor Favale's name be retained in some ways in future grant-giving, subject to the Charity Commission's consent. This option would allow the City Corporation to effectively meet its charity trustee obligations.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 23rd day of July, 2019.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Jeremy Lewis Simons

Chairman, Port Health and Environmental Services Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – Community and Children's Services Committee Amendment to the Committee's Terms of Reference

To be presented on Thursday, 10th October 2019

To the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled.

SUMMARY

At the meeting of the Community and Children's Services Committee on 8 May 2019, Members received the Annual Order of the Court appointing the Committee and setting its Terms of Reference (as set out in Appendix A to this report). Whilst receiving the Order, it was suggested that the Terms of Reference might benefit from being widened to reflect more accurately the large amount of development underway on the City of London Corporation's housing estates, which the Committee was responsible for overseeing. This was discussed further at the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub (Community and Children's Services) Committee, where Members proposed the following amendment (additional text is shown in italics and capitals):-

- **Social Housing** (i.e. the management *AND DEVELOPMENT* of the property owned by the City of London Corporation, *WITHIN ITS EXISTING ESTATES*, under the Housing Revenue Account and the City Fund, in accordance with the requirements of all relevant legislation and the disposal of interests in the City of London Corporation's Housing Estates (pursuant to such policies as are from time to time laid down by the Court of Common Council).

Your Community and Children's Services Committees considered and approved the proposal at its next meeting and this change was subsequently endorsed by your Policy and Resources on 19 September 2019. The Court is now **recommended** to approve the amendment.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That proposed amendments to the Terms of Reference of the Community and Children's Services Committee, as set out in Appendix A (marked using italics and capitals), be approved.

All of which we submit to the judgement of this Honourable Court.

DATED this 19th Day of September 2019.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Randall Keith Anderson

Chairman, Community and Children's Services Committee

N.B. Proposed changes at (b) marked with capitals and italics.

4. Terms of Reference

To be responsible for:-

- (a) the appointment of the Director of Community & Children's Services;
- (b) the following functions of the City of London Corporation (other than in respect of powers expressly delegated to another committee, sub-committee, board or panel):-
 - Children's Services
 - Adults' Services
 - Education (to include the nomination/appointment of Local Authority Governors; as appropriate)
 - Social Services
 - Social Housing (i.e. the management AND DEVELOPMENT of the property owned by the City of London Corporation, WITHIN ITS EXISTING ESTATES, under the Housing Revenue Account and the City Fund, in accordance with the requirements of all relevant legislation and the disposal of interests in the City of London Corporation's Housing Estates (pursuant to such policies as are from time to time laid down by the Court of Common Council).
 - Public health (within the meaning of the Health and Social Care Act 2012), liaison with health services and health scrutiny
 - Sport/Leisure Activities
 - Management of the City of London Almshouses (registered charity no 1005857) in accordance with the charity's governing instruments
 - Marriage Licensing and the Registration Service

and the preparation of all statutory plans relating to those functions and consulting as appropriate on the exercise of those functions;

- (c) appointing Statutory Panels, Boards and Sub-Committees as are considered necessary for the better performance of its duties including the following areas:-
 - Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee
 - Safeguarding Sub-Committee
 - Integrated Commissioning Sub-Committee
 - Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Sub-Committee
- (d) the management of The City of London Corporation Combined Relief of Poverty Charity (registered charity no. 1073660):
- (e) making recommendations to the Education Board on the policy to be adopted for the application of charitable funds from The City of London Corporation Combined Education Charity (registered charity no. 312836) and the City Educational Trust Fund (registered charity no. 290840); and to make appointments to the Sub-Committee established by the Education Board for the purpose of managing those charities.
- (f) the management of the Aldgate Pavilion.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted



By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

