



**RUSSELL, MAYOR**

**LUDER, LOCUM TENENS**

**COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL**

**8th October 2020**  
**MEMBERS PRESENT**

**ALDERMEN**

Nicholas Anstee  
Sir Charles Edward Beck Bowman  
Emma Edhem  
Sir Peter Estlin  
John Garbutt  
Sir Roger Gifford  
Alison Gowman  
Prem Goyal  
David Andrew Graves

Timothy Russell Hailes  
Robert Picton Seymour Howard  
Robert Charles Hughes-Penney  
Gregory Jones QC  
Vincent Thomas Keaveny  
Alastair John Naisbitt King  
Susan Langley  
Ian David Luder  
Nicholas Stephen Leland Lyons

Sheriff Professor Michael Raymond Mainelli  
Sir Andrew Charles Parmley  
The Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor, William Anthony  
Bowater Russell  
The Rt Hon the Baroness Patricia Scotland of  
Asthall, QC  
Sir David Hugh Wootton  
Sir Alan Colin Drake Yarrow

**COMMONERS**

George Christopher Abrahams  
Caroline Kordai Addy  
Munsur Ali  
Randall Keith Anderson  
Alexander Robertson Martin Barr  
Douglas Barrow  
Matthew Bell  
Deputy John Bennett  
Peter Gordon Bennett  
Nicholas Michael Bensted-Smith  
Christopher Paul Boden  
Mark Bostock  
Deputy Keith David Forbes  
Bottomley  
Deputy David John Bradshaw  
Tijs Broeke  
Deputy Michael John Cassidy  
Deputy Roger Arthur Holden  
Chadwick  
John Douglas Chapman  
Dominic Gerard Christian  
Thomas Cowley Clementi  
Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst  
Graeme Doshi-Smith  
Simon D'Olier Duckworth

Deputy Peter Gerard Dunphy  
Mary Durcan  
John Ernest Edwards  
Deputy Kevin Malcolm Everett  
Anne Helen Fairweather  
Helen Lesley Fentimen  
Sophie Anne Fernandes  
John William Fletcher  
Marianne Bernadette Fredericks  
Tracey Graham  
Caroline Wilma Haines  
The Revd Stephen Decatur  
Haines  
Graeme Harrower  
Sheriff 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  
Jones

Shravan Jashvantrai Joshi  
Angus Knowles-Cutler  
Tim Levene  
Vivienne Littlechild  
Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-  
Owen  
Oliver Arthur Wynlayne Lodge  
Deputy Edward Lord  
Paul Nicholas Martinelli  
Jeremy Mayhew  
Deputy Catherine McGuinness  
Andrew Stratton McMurtrie  
Wendy Mead  
Deputy Robert Allan Merrett  
Andrien Gereith Dominic Meyers  
Deputy Brian Desmond Francis  
Mooney  
Deputy Hugh Fenton Morris  
Deputy Alastair Michael Moss  
Benjamin Daniel Murphy  
Barbara Patricia Newman  
Graham Packham  
Dhruv Patel  
Susan Jane Pearson  
John Petrie

William Pimlott  
Judith Pleasance  
Deputy James Henry George  
Pollard  
Stephen Douglas Quilter  
Deputy Elizabeth Rogula  
James de Sausmarez  
Ruby Sayed  
John George Stewart Scott  
Ian Christopher Norman Seaton  
Oliver Sells QC  
Deputy Dr Giles Robert Evelyn  
Shilson  
Jeremy Lewis Simons  
Deputy Tom Sleight  
Sir Michael Snyder  
Deputy James Michael Douglas  
Thomson  
Deputy John Tomlinson  
James Richard Tumbridge  
William Upton QC  
Mark Raymond Peter Henry  
Delano Wheatley  
Deputy Philip Woodhouse  
Dawn Linsey Wright

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

2. Declarations There were no additional declarations.
3. Minutes *Resolved* – That the minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded, subject to the following amendments:-
- Angus Knowles-Cutler, and Alderwoman Susan Langley be recorded as having been in attendance.
  - On page 14, under Item 13, the reference to Adrian Bostock be corrected to Adrian Bastow, and the reference to Deputy John Bradshaw be corrected to Deputy David Bradshaw.
4. Letter The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor laid before the Court a letter declaring his assent to take upon himself continued office.
5. Resolutions There were no resolutions.
6. Mayoral Visits The Rt Hon the Lord Mayor took the opportunity to update the Court on his virtual engagement programme.
7. Policy Statement The Chair of Policy and Resources Committee outlined a number of key items for the coming period, including next steps for the Governance Review and the ongoing implications of the COVID response.
8. Hospital Seal There were no docquets for the Seal.
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.

<b>Craig Jamie Brummel</b> <i>Hilary Miller</i> <i>Colin Trevor Gurnett</i>	a Police Officer <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	Witham, Essex
<b>Robert Murel Clark</b>  <i>William Paret Boswell</i> <i>Peter Kurrild-Klitgaard</i>	an Attorney-at-Law  <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	Dallas, Texas, United States of America
<b>Jonathan Piers Worsley Coleman</b> <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Solicitor  <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	East Sussex
<b>Neil Christopher Duke</b>  <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Film Scenery Manufacturing Company Director <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Virginia Water, Surrey
<b>John Patrick Fitzpatrick</b>  <i>Mark Sutherland Johnson</i> <i>Malcolm Alastair Craig</i>	a Reinsurance Consultant  <i>Citizen and Woolman</i> <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	Chicago, Illinois, United States of America
<b>Peter Michael Frost</b>	a Business Marketing Consultant,	Croydon, Surrey

<i>Donald Howard Coombe, MBE</i> <i>David Peter Coombe</i>	retired <i>Citizen and Poulter</i> <i>Citizen and Poulter</i>	
<b>Simon John Halliday</b> <i>Malcolm Alastair Craig</i> <i>Mark Sutherland Johnson</i>	a Rugby Tournament Chairman <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and Woolman</i>	Salisbury, Wiltshire
<b>Steven James Harris</b> <i>Anthony John Paice</i> <i>Martin Victor Edwards</i>	a Chief Financial Officer <i>Citizen and Mason</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	East Sheen, London
<b>Keith George Homewood</b> <i>Leslie Gordon Alwyne Clarke</i> <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i>	an Ofsted Inspector, retired <i>Citizen and Plaisterer</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Guildford, Surrey
<b>Ali Aklakul Islam</b> <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Restaurant Owner <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Luton, Bedfordshire
<b>Steven Christopher Kelleher</b> <i>Colin George Ring</i> <i>George Richard Cannell</i>	a Recruitment Company Director <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Wallington, Surrey
<b>Colin Macdonald</b> <i>Lt Col Marcus Richard Appleton</i> <i>Douglas Pang Dau</i>	a Trainer and Systems Analyst, retired <i>Citizen and Cook</i> <i>Citizen and Baker</i>	Hampshire
<b>Hector Stanley Mann</b> <i>Roy Keith Sully</i> <i>Ian Kelly</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Art Scholar</i> <i>Citizen and Butcher</i>	Mottingham, London
<b>Stephen John McGuinness</b> <i>Alan Leslie Warman</i> <i>Diane Irene Warman</i>	a Royal Air Force Musician <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Ruislip, Middlesex
<b>Caroline Muir</b> <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Diplomat, retired <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Balham, London
<b>Eric Robert Newnham</b> <i>Ald. &amp; Sheriff Prof. Michael Raymond Mainelli</i> <i>Elisabeth Mainelli</i>	a Media Company Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and World Trader</i> <i>Citizen and Mason</i>	Southwark, London
<b>Mark Trevor Phillips</b> <i>Sir David Wootton, Kt., Ald.</i> <i>Thomas Sleigh, Deputy</i>	a Journalist & Businessman <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	Kentish Town, London
<b>William Douglas Buchanan Radcliffe</b> <i>David Gordon Hope-Mason</i> <i>Philippa Jane Meryl Dutton, MVO</i>	a Group Investor Relations Director <i>Citizen and Fruiterer</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Ashtead, Surrey
<b>Kutub Uddin Ahmed Shikder, MBE</b> <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Dorothy Newlands of Lauriston</i>	a Barrister <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Hackney, London
<b>Geoffrey Austin Thompson</b>	a Headmaster, retired	Hertfordshire

*Martin Henry Charles Russell, TD*      *Citizen and Farrier*  
*Sir Kenneth Aphunzezi Olisa, OBE*      *Citizen and Information Technologist*

**Duchess Kerrol Michelle**      an Events Coordinator      Highgate, London  
**Madalitso Williams-Alonga**  
*Timothy John Macandrews, TD JP*      *Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer*  
*Luis Hui*      *Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer*

**Gina Mary Wilson**      a Solicitor      Kensington, London  
*Neal Kelvin Goldsmith*      *Citizen and Innholder*  
*John Howard*      *Citizen and Innholder*

*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 thereby ordered that the Chamberlain do admit them severally to their Freedom accordingly.

10.  
 Bill for Act of  
 Common  
 Council

**Bill for an Act of Common Council: Common Council Elections**

A Bill for an Act of Common Council, to provide for the date of the next ordinary Common Council elections being postponed from 18 March 2021 until 23 March 2022, was presented to the Court for its third reading, together with a report of the Policy and Resources Committee thereon.

*Resolved* – That the report be agreed to and that the Bill be read a third time, do pass into Law and do become an Act of Common Council.

11.  
 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**

**The Coronavirus Act 2020 (Residential Tenancies: Protection from Eviction) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020 No.914**  
 Schedule 29 of the Coronavirus Act 2020 requires landlords to provide at least three months' notice of intention to seek possession of housing let under a Rent Act 1977 protected or statutory tenancy, a secure tenancy, a flexible tenancy, an assured tenancy, an assured shorthold tenancy, an introductory tenancy or a demoted tenancy let by a local authority or housing action trust. These regulations extend that provision, which was to end on 30th September 2020, to 31st March 2021. The regulations also extend the required notice period in most cases to 6 months.

29 August 2020

**The Prosecution of Offences (Custody Time Limits) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No. 953**

28 September  
 2020

These Regulations amend the Prosecution of Offences (Custody Time Limits) Regulations 1987 ("the 1987 Regulations") to increase custody time limits for those awaiting trial in the Crown Court, including the Central Criminal Court, from 112 days to 168 days, in response to the effect of the pandemic on jury trials. The Regulations cease to have effect on 28th June 2021 and do not apply to an accused who was in custody in relation to an offence and subject to a custody time limit provided in the 1987 Regulations before these Regulations came into force.

**The Business Tenancies (Protection from Forfeiture: Relevant Period) (Coronavirus) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2020 No. 994** 29 September 2020

S.82 of the Coronavirus Act 2020 provides that a right of re-entry or forfeiture, under a relevant business tenancy, for non-payment of rent may not be enforced, by action or otherwise, during the relevant period. These Regulations extend the relevant period from 30<sup>th</sup> September to 31st December 2020. The 2020 Act defines “relevant business tenancy” as a tenancy to which Part 2 of the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954 applies, or to which that Part of that Act would apply if any relevant occupier were the tenant.

**The Taking Control of Goods (Amendment) (Coronavirus) Regulations 2020 No. 1002** 29 September 2020

These Regulations amend previous Regulations made in 2013, with the effect that, during the relevant period, the minimum amount of net unpaid rent before an enforcement action for commercial rent arrears recovery can take place is 276 days’ rent where it takes place on or before 24th December 2020 and 366 days’ rent where it takes place on or after 25th December 2020. The relevant period has been extended to 31st December. These amendments do not affect any enforcement action taken prior to their coming into force.

**The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (No. 2) (England) (Amendment) (No. 5) Regulations 2020** 24 September 2020

The effect of these Regulations is that certain businesses (listed in Schedule 3 of the Regulations) must not provide their services during the emergency period (which ends on a day to be specified by the Secretary of State) between the hours of 22:00 and 05:00. These Regulations impact on the business of venues in the City including restaurants, bars and pubs.

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

12.  
Appointments

The Court proceeded to consider appointments to the following Committees:-

- (A) Two Members on the **Planning and Transportation Committee**, for the balance of terms expiring in April 2021.

**Nominations received:-**

Helen Lesley Fentimen, O.B.E.  
Michael Hudson  
William Pimlott

Read.

*Resolved* – That, in accordance with the outcomes of the indicative ballot process, the appointment to the Planning and Transportation Committee of Helen Fentimen and Michael Hudson, for terms expiring in April 2021, be confirmed.

- (B) One Member on the **City Bridge Trust Committee**, for the balance of a

term expiring in April 2023.

**Nominations received:-**

Judith Lindsay Pleasance  
Deputy James Henry George Pollard  
Jeremy Lewis Simons

Read.

*Resolved* – That, in accordance with the outcomes of the indicative ballot process, the appointment to the City Bridge Trust Committee of Judith Pleasance, for a term expiring in April 2024, be confirmed.

- (C) Eight Members on the **Community and Children’s Services Committee**, for the balance of terms expiring in April 2021.

**Nominations received:-**

Mark Bostock

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Mark Bostock to be appointed to the Community and Children’s Services Committee, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2021.

13.

Questions

*Harrower, G.G.,  
to the Chair of  
the Policy and  
Resources  
Committee*

**Planning Regime Reform**

Graeme Harrower asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee, asking whether she would commit to bringing recommendations to the Court proposing that the City of London Corporation’s planning regime be reformed so as to comply with the recommendations made in the recently published Transparency International UK report relating to planning governance.

Responding, the Chair advised that she would be happy to discuss the recommendations with the Chairman of Planning and Transportation and whether the City of London Corporation should make any changes to current practice based on them; however, she did not feel it was appropriate to commit to bringing recommendations at this point in time. She also suggested that any changes should be incorporated as part of the wider governance review process following the Lisvane Review.

Graeme Harrower asked a supplementary question, querying whether two specific proposals could be committed to, namely implementing the measure concerning transparency of meetings with developers, and the measure relating Members who had connections with the property industry being made ineligible to sit on the Planning and Transportation Committee. He suggested that a failure to make such a commitment would justify views outside the Guildhall that the City Corporation was not a fit body to exercise the functions of a public authority.

In reply, the Chair reiterated her undertaking to discuss the matter with the Chair of Planning and Transportation in the first instance. She challenged the assertion that

the City Corporation was not a fit body to carry out its planning functions, suggesting that the assertion was unfounded and inappropriate. She noted the legal duty to promote high standards of conduct and to manage conflicts of interest to that high level, observing that the City complied fully with all relevant legal requirements. Should the Honourable Member have any evidence of wrongdoing, this should be submitted to the City Corporation's Standards Committee.

Paul Martinelli asked a supplementary question relating to wider governance concerns, specifically around the format of meetings, asking whether the Chair would commit today to holding a fully hybrid meeting for the informal meeting of the Court scheduled for 12 November 2020.

The Chair expressed the view that it would be inappropriate to do so at this stage in the pandemic, noting the challenges of holding such large-scale hybrid meetings with social distancing measures currently in place and particularly the stricter rules that were likely to be implemented in the coming period. She confirmed that plans to hold hybrid committee meetings were being progressed, with technology already installed in the North Wing which had allowed a small number of hybrid meetings to take place during September. Similar technology was also being installed in the Committee Rooms. Officers were exploring what could be done in the Great Hall and Livery Hall; however, there would be a high cost associated with these. Given the current stage of the pandemic, the Chair urged colleagues to consider keeping their committee meetings virtual as far as possible for now, with the situation kept under review.

In response to a supplementary question from Deputy Philip Woodhouse, in which he emphasised the importance of showing leadership in returning to the City through hybrid meetings, the Chair reiterated her previous comments in relation to the significant efforts being taken to support the Square Mile through this difficult period. She reminded Members that many of the Corporation's own officers were now back in the office and that some had also been on-site throughout the entire period. However, this had to be managed in such a way as to observe the rules around social distancing and with a view as to how best to conduct business. The opportunity of hybrid meetings would, of course, be kept under regular review but she questioned whether proceeding at this point in time would really be demonstrating the sort of leadership that the City Corporation should be showing. She suggested that efforts at this time would be best-placed into working with to ensure the Square Mile was in the fittest state possible when recovery properly began, raising in every single quarter the need to look very carefully at the safety guidance so that the economy could continue to operate safely.

Replying to an additional supplementary question from Andrew McMurtrie, in which he echoed the comments made by Deputy Woodhouse in respect of setting an example and urged the use of pragmatism and common-sense, whilst also querying the costs of hybrid meetings, the Chair confirmed that the costs of holding and live-streaming a hybrid Court of Common Council meeting from the Great Hall would be around £8,000. The Chair also cautioned that further restrictions were likely to be applied in London shortly and it would be vital to comply with these, regardless of whether they were liked or not. Work was underway to try and influence these measures, with the Chair arguing for the economy in every possible

setting; however, concerted and co-ordinated efforts across London would be important.

*Harrower, G.G.,  
to the Chair of  
the Policy and  
Resources  
Committee*

### **Lord Mayor's Show**

Graeme Harrower asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee regarding the Lord Mayor's Show, querying whether Taiwan would be invited to participate in next year's event.

Responding, the Chair expressed her sadness that this year's Lord Mayor's Show had had to be cancelled, albeit this was fully understandable in the circumstances. She advised that The Lord Mayor's Show was organised and run by a company formed for that purpose and not by the City Corporation; however, from initial conversations, she understood that it was too early to say what the arrangements would be for 2021 or who might participate.

Graeme Harrower asked a supplementary question, through which he sought the Chair's view as to whether Taiwan should be invited to participate, noting that the People's Republic of China had been allowed to participate previously. Replying, the Chair commented that the Show was not a political event but a family-orientated day out, aimed at welcoming the new Lord Mayor into office. She suggested that it should be kept non-political and that, should people wish to apply to run their floats in it, she was sure that the company would consider those applications where there was space.

Mark Wheatley asked a further supplementary question, seeking clarity as to why Taiwan had been welcome to participate in previous years but was not allowed to attend last year's Show, when the People's Republic of China had floats involved, which suggested partial treatment. Responding, the Chair advised that she was not in a position to answer that question, as any considerations would have been made and determined by the company. She added that the City should be very proud of the fact that the Lord Mayor's Show was a non-political event in which many participants from all over the world wished to come and participate.

*Scot, J.G.S., J.P.,  
to the Chair of  
the Policy and  
Resources  
Committee*

### **Common Hall**

John Scott asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee regarding Common Hall and the perception of giving precedence to ceremonial activities over committee meetings.

Responding, the Chair noted that the City Corporation had sought to reflect the position taken in the Coronavirus Regulations in relation to elections, making reference to the cancelled Common Hall for the Election of Sheriffs in June. However, the differing constitutional requirements for the Election of Lord Mayor had not permitted the same approach and the nature of relevant legislation also meant that procedures such as postal or electronic voting and participation were not available: in short, there had been no choice legally but to conduct the process physically and on the scheduled date but in compliance with social distancing requirements. The Chair provided a brief summary of the steps taken to ensure compliance and to streamline proceedings and thanked those who had contributed to the efforts ensuring the City's legal obligations were met in a safe and compliant manner, allowing the Lord Mayor to be re-elected for a second term of office.



Patel, D., O.B.E.,  
to the Chair of  
the Policy and  
Resources  
Committee

### **Covid Recovery and Support for the City**

Dhruv Patel asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee in relation to the future of the City and a rebalancing of focus away from internal matters, commenting on the dramatic impact of the current crisis on the retail, arts and leisure sectors and the long-term consequence for London as a global centre.

Responding, the Chair sympathised with the concerns expressed and highlighted the importance of addressing some of the comments raised by Lord Lisvane through his Governance Review, which would ensure that the City Corporation remained relevant and effective, and that it was in the best shape to be able support the long-term future of the City. The Chair assured Members that the Corporation had been doing all that it could to support City businesses through this difficult time, with serious and concerted efforts taken. This included work to secure the future of the cultural and creative sectors, as well as continued activity on international competitiveness, alongside calls for a safe, secure and flexible return to offices to allow the economy to operate. The Chair agreed with the importance of pace and was pleased to confirm the imminent publication of a report looking at what London needed to do to maintain its position for the future. Work was also underway to establish a Covid Recovery Commission to focus on the City's recovery: it was clear that there would be much work to do and difficult times ahead, and it would be vital for the City Corporation to support the Square Mile through them.

Deputy Tom Sleight, through a supplementary question, highlighted some of the concerted activity that he was aware of through collaboration with London Councils, whilst also commenting on the significant support the City had been able to offer as a landlord, having continually taken action to support its retail tenants. Whilst there would always be a question of balance about the appropriate level of support, it would be unfair to suggest that significant assistance had not been offered to date and he expressed his hope that the City would continue to support its tenants who were struggling, particularly those at-risk retail and leisure tenants. He also questioned whether information-sharing on the range of support offered could be improved, both to Members beyond, to raise awareness.

In reply, the Chair agreed that the range of activity across the City's property portfolio, through the City Bridge Trust in supporting civil society, with London Boroughs, and through work on bodies such as the London Recovery Board and the London Transition Board, could be better communicated. She also cautioned that there would be further challenges and it would not be feasible to help all out tenants in the longer-term because of the economic scale of the crisis; however, the City would continue to do all that it reasonably could and efforts would be taken to improve communications to Members and beyond.

#### 14. Motions

Fredericks, M.F.;  
Newman, B.P.,  
C.B.E.

*Motion* – “That this Honourable Court resolves that the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee begins the implementation of the recommendations made in Part 8 of Lord Lisvane's Report by presenting a detailed report on a new standards regime to the Policy and Resources Committee which then presents a detailed report on that regime to the Court at its meeting in January 2021, with a view to the regime being implemented by the end of March 2021 at the latest.”

Marianne Fredericks spoke to introduce the Motion, reminding Members of the significant agreement amongst Members at the June meeting of the Court that reform of the standards regime was needed. She noted that Lord Lisvane's Governance Review recommendations in relation to this matter had now been submitted and urged that they be taken forward as a matter of priority. Barbara Newman seconded the motion, concurring that reform was well overdue and observing that the Motion provided a manageable and realistic timetable for change.

Holmes, A.;  
Fredericks, M.B.

*Amendment* – That the word “regimes” in the penultimate line of the Motion be deleted and replaced with “the regime’s system for handling complaints”.

During debate, it was noted that the work currently handled by the Standards Committee went further than simply complaints and it was suggested that an amendment could be beneficial to allow for a focus on that particular area of concern and mitigate against the risk of other issues preventing progress from being made. The Mover and Seconder of the Motion confirmed their willingness to accept this amendment, whereupon the Lord Mayor declared the Amendment to be carried.

Members proceeded to debate the Motion as amended.

Whilst expressing support for the aims of the Motion, concerns were raised that the wording in its current format had the effect of accepting Lord Lisvane's findings as unquestionably correct. It was argued that it might be precipitate to assume this prior to the opportunity for wider scrutiny and review by all Members in the normal way, with it suggested that a rash decision now could have the unintended consequence of preventing a fair regime with the support of all Members from being created. It was ventured that the eagerness to initiate change meant that action might well be being over-simplified, with it observed that certain recommendations made by Lord Lisvane were more controversial than might necessarily be appreciated.

Estlin, Sir Peter,  
Ald.; Lord, C.E.,  
O.B.E., J.P., Deputy

*Amendment* – That the word “implementation” be replaced with the word “consideration”.

Discussion ensued on a further prospective amendment, intended to alleviate concerns in relation to the direct implementation of Lord Lisvane's recommendation without opportunity for further Member scrutiny. During debate, it was confirmed that the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee had given an undertaking to engage fully on the Lisvane Review's proposals as part of the next steps.

A Division being demanded and granted, there appeared:-

*For the Affirmative – 67*

**ALDERMEN**

Bowman, Sir Charles  
Edhem, E.  
Estlin, Sir Peter  
Garbutt, J.  
Gifford, Sir Roger  
Gowman, A.J.  
Goyal, P.B., O.B.E.

Graves, D.A.  
Hailes, T.R.  
Howard, R.P.S.  
Hughes-Penney, R.C.  
Jones, G.P., Q.C.  
Keaveny, V.T.  
King, A.J.N.

Langley, S., O.B.E.  
Luder, I.D.  
Mainelli, Prof. M.R.M., Sheriff  
Parmley, Sir Andrew  
Scotland, Baroness Patricia, Q.C.  
W.A.B. Russell, The Rt Hon The  
Lord Mayor

## COMMONERS

Addy, C.K.	Haines, C.W.	Murphy, B.D.
Ali, M.	Hayward, C.M., Sheriff	Petrie, J.
Barrow, D.G.F.	Hoffman, T.D.D., M.B.E., Deputy	Pleasance, J.L.
Bennett, P.G.	Holmes, A.	Rogula, E., Deputy
Boden, C.P.	Joshi, S.J.	Sayed, R.
Bottomley, K.D.F., Deputy	Knowles-Cutler, A.	Sells, O.M., Q.C.
Bradshaw, D.J., Deputy	Levene, T.C.	Shilson, Dr G.R.E., Deputy
Chadwick, R.A.H., O.B.E., Deputy	Littlechild, V., M.B.E.	Simons, J.L.
De Sausmarez, H.J.	Lodge, O.A.	Sleigh, T., Deputy
Doshi-Smith, G.M.	Lord, C.E., O.B.E., Deputy	Snyder, Sir Michael
Duckworth, S.D., O.B.E., D.L.	Martinelli, P.N.	Thomson, J.M.D., Deputy
Durcan, M.	McGuinness, C.S., Deputy	Tumbridge, J.R.
Edwards, J.E.	Mead, W., O.B.E.	Upton, W.M., Q.C.
Everett, K.M., Deputy	Merrett, R.A., Deputy	Woodhouse, P.J., Deputy
Fairweather, A.H.	Meyers, A.G.D.	Wright, D.L.
Fernandes, S.A.	Moss, A.M., Deputy	

Tellers for the affirmative – Deputy Edward Lord and Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark.

*For the Negative – 33*

## ALDERMEN

Lyons, N.S.L.	Wootton, Sir David	Yarrow, Sir Alan
---------------	--------------------	------------------

## COMMONERS

Anderson, R.K.	Fletcher, J.W.	McMurtrie, A.S.
Barr, A.R.M.	Fredericks, M.B.	Mooney, B.D.F., Deputy
Bell, M.	Graham, T.	Patel, D., O.B.E.
Bennett, J.A., Deputy	Haines, Revd. S.D.	Pearson, S.
Bensted-Smith, N.B.	Harrower, G.G.	Pimlott, W.
Bostock, M.	Hill, C.	Pollard, J.H.G., Deputy
Chapman, J.D.	Hudson, M.	Quilter, S.D.
Colthurst, H.N.A.	Hyde, W.M., Deputy	Scott, J.G.S.
Dunphy, P.G., Deputy	Lloyd-Owen, N.M.C.	Tomlinson, J., Deputy
Fentimen, H.L., O.B.E.	Mayhew, J.P.	Wheatley, M.R.P.H.D.

Tellers for the negative – Tijs Broeke and Henry Colthurst.

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

*Motion* – That the Question (i.e. the Motion as amended) be now put.

Upon the Motion being put, the Lord Mayor declared it to be carried and directed that the Motion as amended be put to the Court forthwith.

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

*Resolved* – That this Honourable Court resolves that the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee begins the consideration of the recommendations made in Part 8 of Lord Lisvane's Report by presenting a detailed report on a new standards regime to the Policy and Resources Committee which then presents a detailed report on that regime to the Court at its meeting in January 2021, with a view to the regime's system for handling complaints being implemented by the end of March 2021 at the latest.

Locum Tenens

At this point in proceedings, the Town Clerk reported that the Lord Mayor needed to depart the meeting in order to attend an official engagement. Accordingly, at this point 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.

Pleasance, J.L.;  
Boden, C.P.

*Motion* – That, pursuant to Standing Order 6(3), the order of business be amended to allow for Item 16(A) to be considered as the next item of business.

Following a period of debate, the Motion to amend the order of business was withdrawn.

Lloyd-Owen,  
N.M.C.; Ali, M.

*Motion* – “That this Honourable Court declares a Climate Emergency with immediate effect, in light of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report, which outlined the need for immediate action if global temperatures are to be kept within 1.5 degrees of pre-industrial levels; and in line with hundreds of District, County, Unitary & Metropolitan Councils that have already declared a Climate Emergency.

That this Honourable Court agree the following commitments to support this declaration:

1. Climate change is an existential threat, our highest corporate risk and will be prioritised accordingly.
2. The amount of funding agreed in the Climate Action Strategy will be regarded as a minimum starting point.
3. This funding will be protected, regardless of changes in funding sources.
4. A clear roadmap to achieving the 2027 and 2040 net-zero targets for the Corporation and its whole value chain will be set out urgently, including interim target dates.
5. Regular assessment will be made of our capacity to increase funding so as to reach the net-zero targets as soon as possible.
6. Lord Lisvane’s recommendation that a “green impact assessment” should accompany every policy or project proposal submitted to a committee, will be implemented immediately. The Court must not wait for the full implementation of the Climate Action Strategy in April 2021.
7. A Biodiversity Action Plan (to replace the Biodiversity Action Plan 2016-2020) will be implemented by April 2021, alongside the Climate Action Strategy.
8. Meaningful consultation will take place with a wide range of City residents, workers and students, alongside engagement with wider communities, particularly young people.
9. If there is evidence for a projected increase in global temperatures of more than 2 degrees, we will revisit and increase our investment in climate resilience before 2030 to enable us to prepare for the worst-case scenario”.

Natasha Lloyd-Owen spoke to open the debate, outlining the rationale behind the

various commitments proposed with the Motion. She argued that the Motion, if passed, would reinforce the aims of the Climate Action Strategy proposed for adoption at Item 16(A), as well as ensuring that the scale of climate change and the challenge faced was acknowledged and at the forefront of Members' minds moving forwards.

Abrahams, G.C.;  
Harrower, G.G.

*Motion* – That, in accordance with Standing Order 2, Standing Order 12(6) be suspended to allow for debate in respect of Motions to continue.

A Division being demanded and granted, there appeared:-

*For the Affirmative – 70*

ALDERMEN

Estlin, Sir Peter  
Garbutt, J.  
Gifford, Sir Roger  
Gowman, A.J.  
Goyal, P.B., O.B.E.

Graves, D.A.  
Hailes, T.R.  
Howard, R.P.S.  
Jones, G.P., Q.C.  
Keaveny, V.T.

King, A.J.N.  
Langley, S., O.B.E.  
Mainelli, Prof. M.R., Sheriff  
Parmley, Sir Andrew  
Wootton, Sir David

COMMONERS

Abrahams, G.C.  
Addy, C.K.  
Ali, M.  
Anderson, R.K.  
Barr, A.R.M.  
Bell, M.  
Bostock, M.  
Bottomley, K.D.F., Deputy  
Broeke, T.  
Chapman, J.D.  
Duckworth, S.D., O.B.E., D.L.  
Durcan, M.  
Everett, K.M., Deputy  
Fairweather, A.H.  
Fentimen, H.L., O.B.E.  
Fredericks, M.B.  
Graham, T.  
Haines, C.W.  
Harrower, G.G.

Hayward, C.M., Sheriff  
Hill, C.  
Holmes, A.  
Ingham Clark, J., Deputy  
Joshi, S.J.  
Knowles-Cutler, A.  
Levene, T.C.  
Littlechild, V., M.B.E.  
Lloyd-Owen, N.M.C.  
Lord, C.E., O.B.E., Deputy  
Martinelli, P.N.  
Mayhew, J.P.  
McGuinness, C.S., Deputy  
McMurtrie, A.S.  
Mead, W., O.B.E.  
Merrett, R.A., Deputy  
Murphy, B.D.  
Newman, B.P., C.B.E.

Packham, G.D.  
Patel, D., O.B.E.  
Pearson, S.J.  
Petrie, J.  
Pimlott, W.  
Pleasance, J.L.  
Pollard, J.H.G., Deputy  
Quilter, S.D.  
Sayed, R.  
Scott, J.G.S.  
Simons, J.L.  
Sleigh, T., Deputy  
Thomson, J.M.D., Deputy  
Tomlinson, J., Deputy  
Upton, W.M., Q.C.  
Wheatley, M.R.P.H.D.  
Woodhouse, P.J., Deputy  
Wright, D.L.

Tellers for the affirmative – Deputy Edward Lord and Susan Pearson.

*For the Negative – 17*

ALDERMEN

Bowman, Sir Charles

Edhem, E.

Hughes-Penney, R.C.

COMMONERS

Barrow, D.G.F.  
Bennett, P.G.  
Bennett, J.A., M.B.E., Deputy  
Boden, C.P.  
Bradshaw, D.J., Deputy

Chadwick, R.A.H., O.B.E., Deputy  
De Sausmarez, H.J.  
Edwards, J.E.  
Fletcher, J.W.  
Haines, Revd. S.D.

Hoffman, T.D.D., M.B.E., Deputy  
Hudson, M.  
Rogula, E., Deputy  
Tumbridge, J.R.

Tellers for the negative – Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark and John Fletcher.

An abstention was recorded from Deputy Brian Mooney.

Upon the results of the Division being announced, the Lord Mayor declared the

Motion to be carried.

*Resolved* – That, in accordance with Standing Order 2, Standing Order 12(6) be suspended to allow for debate in respect of Motions to continue.

Members proceeded to debate the Motion.

During discussion, the following arguments were advanced:

- The value of declaring a Climate Emergency was queried, with it observed that, of those authorities who had declared such an Emergency, only half had published action plans and even fewer put funding plans in place. Consequently, it was suggested that it would be better to take action via the robust Climate Action Strategy proposed at Item 16(A), rather than focus on declarations, with it noted that the proposed Strategy was funded, based on detailed modelling and analysis, and set out achievable targets and tangible actions with established mechanisms for measurement and scrutiny.
- A Member queried the suggestion of Climate Change being the highest corporate risk, with it noted that this was not currently the case and that any such amendment to the corporate risk register would require proper institutional support and costed measures; making such a change without any preparatory activity could give the impression that the City Corporation was merely seeking to undertake “greenwashing” and would be an inappropriate way to take forward such a fundamental issue.
- Whilst welcoming the attention being brought to such an important issue, it was urged that the significant leadership role the City Corporation had taken in this area over the past years not be forgotten. Particular reference was made to the Green Finance Taskforce and Green Finance Institute, as well as the wide range of engagements which had sought to find tangible and practical ways to mobilise investment into carbon-related initiatives. A Member expressed concern that the Motion gave the impression that the City had been slow to take action to date and risked trivialising the substantial efforts made.
- Several Members argued that the Motion and the Climate Action Strategy should not be seen as mutually exclusive and that it was a false dichotomy to suggest so. Whilst the Strategy was clearly to be welcomed and would take the City Corporation a long way forwards, the Motion would provide complementary support and protection to the commitments made within the Strategy, thereby enhancing it.
- Reference was made to the Duke of Cambridge’s “Earthshot” campaign and the need to be highly ambitious in taking action on this vital issue.

Lord, C.E., O.B.E.,  
Deputy; Broeke, T.

*Motion* – That the Question be now put.

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

Natasha Lloyd-Owen spoke to close the debate.

A Division being demanded and granted in respect of the substantive Motion, there

appeared:-

*For the Affirmative – 18*

**COMMONERS**

Abrahams, G.C.	Chapman, J.D.	Murphy, B.D.
Ali, M.	Fentimen, H.L., O.B.E.	Newman, B.P.
Anderson, R.K.	Fredericks, M.B.	Pearson, S.J.
Bell, M.	Hill, C.	Pimlott, W.
Bostock, M.	Lloyd-Owen	Quilter, S.D.
Broeke, T.	Lord, C.E., O.B.E., Deputy	Upton, W.M.

Tellers for the affirmative – Natasha Lloyd-Owen and Deputy Edward Lord.

*For the Negative – 59*

**ALDERMEN**

Bowman, Sir Charles	Graves, D.A.	Luder, I.D.
Edhem, E.	Hailes, T.R.	Lyons, N.S.L.
Estlin, Sir Peter	Howard, R.P.S.	Mainelli, Prof. M.R., Sheriff
Gifford, Sir Roger	Hughes-Penney, R.C.	Parmley, Sir Andrew
Gowman, A.J.	Keaveny, V.T.	Wootton, Sir David
Goyal, P.B., O.B.E.	Langley, S., O.B.E.	

**COMMONERS**

Addy, C.K.	Hayward, C.M., Sheriff	Morris, H.F.
Barr, A.R.M.	Hoffman, T.D.D., M.B.E., Deputy	Packham, G.D.
Barrow, D.G.F.	Holmes, A.	Patel, D., O.B.E.
Bennett, J.A., M.B.E., Deputy	Hudson, M.	Petrie, J.
Bennett, P.G.	Ingham Clark, J., Deputy	Pleasance, J.L.
Bottomley, K.D.F., Deputy	Joshi, S.J.	Pollard, J.H.G., Deputy
Bradshaw, D.J., Deputy	Knowles-Cutler, A.	Rogula, E., Deputy
De Sausmarez, H.J.	Littlechild, V., M.B.E.	Scott, J.G.S.
Durcan, M.	Martinelli, P.N.	Simons, J.L.
Edwards, J.E.	Mayhew, J.P.	Thomson, J.M.D., Deputy
Fernandes, S.A.	McGuinness, C.S., Deputy	Tomlinson, J., Deputy
Fletcher, J.W.	McMurtrie, A.S.	Woodhouse, P.J., Deputy
Graham, T.	Mead, W., O.B.E.	Wright, D.L.
Haines, C.W.	Mooney, B.D.F., Deputy	

Tellers for the negative – Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark and Doug Barrow.

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

15. Awards & Prizes

There was no report.

16.

**POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)**

24 September 2020

**(A) Climate Action Strategy**

The Court considered proposals relating to the adoption of a scoped and costed Climate Action Strategy for the City of London Corporation.

The Chair spoke to introduce the report, commending it as a hallmark strategy which would form the basis of the City's global, political and community engagement for years to come.

It was noted that the Strategy would affect City Fund, City Cash, and Bridge House Estates; consequently, Members would need to be mindful of their roles in respect of the City Corporation funds and as Trustees of Bridge House Estates when considering the proposals.

Several Members spoke in support of the report, advocating the importance of its data-driven and science-based targets, ensuring they were pragmatic, deliverable and would facilitate real and demonstrable impact. The ability to tackle Scope 3 emissions was commented on in particular, with Members noting that the Strategy represented a leadership moment for the City, bringing Climate Action on a par with Green Finance, where the City was already a global leader. The focus on buildings was also commended, with it observed that the City's property portfolio represented its largest single source of carbon emissions and so action here was particularly impactful.

Lloyd-Owen,  
N.M.C.;  
Fredericks, M.B.

*Amendment* – That the following wording be appended to the second recommendation of the report: “*with a commitment that the amount of funding agreed in the Climate Action Strategy will be protected, regardless of changes in funding sources.*”

During debate on the Amendment, several Members expressed reservations in respect of making open-ended commitments on future funding, noting that there were robust mechanisms within the Strategy to ensure the right resources were allocated to various activities and that needs and achievements were kept under constant review.

Bottomley,  
K.D.F., Deputy,  
Hailes, T.R., Ald.

*Motion* – That the Question be now put.

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

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

*Resolved* – That approval be given to:

1. The adoption of the Climate Action Strategy set out at Appendix 1 to the report, together with the actions set by committee at Appendix 2.
2. The allocation of additional budget required to deliver the strategy, as recommended by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and the funding route as referred to in paragraphs 6-10 of the accompanying report.

24 September 2020

### **(B) Bridge House Estates Strategy: Bridging London 2020-2045**

The Court considered the adoption of a new Bridge House Estates (BHE) Strategy: *Bridging London, 2020 – 2045*. The proposed strategy represented an exciting moment in BHE's long history, providing a framework for all of the charity's activities and outlining the collective impact it wished to have through its primary and ancillary objects. It also set out a new vision for the charity where ‘*every person in London becomes truly connected*’, and outlined three new aims to be: *catalytic, sustainable and impact driven*. A high-level implementation plan for the strategy



was also presented.

*Resolved* – That the Court of Common Council, acting collectively in BHE’s (charity no. 1035628) best interests:-

1. Approves the proposed final version of the charity’s overarching Strategy: *Bridging London, 2020-2045*, for the City of London Corporation as Trustee of the charity.
2. Approves the high-level implementation plan for the Strategy: *Bridging London, 2020-2045*.

Lord, C.E.,  
O.B.E., Deputy,  
Hailes, T.R., Ald.

*Motion* – That, in accordance with Standing Order 2, Standing Order 16 be suspended to allow for the meeting to continue.

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

*Resolved* – That, in accordance with Standing Order 2, Standing Order 16 be suspended to allow for the meeting to continue.

## 17. **HOSPITALITY WORKING PARTY OF THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**(Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney, Chief Commoner)**

8 October 2020

### **Applications for Hospitality**

#### **(A) Hanukkah Reception**

It was proposed that the City Corporation host an early evening reception on 16 December 2020 to celebrate the Jewish festival of Hanukkah. The reception would provide an opportunity to celebrate the City Corporation’s historic links with the Jewish community, demonstrate the City Corporation’s commitment to bringing together different communities, and promote London as an inclusive, diverse and multi-faith City. The event would take place in a manner that is consistent with any COVID-related restrictions that might be in place.

It was **recommended** that hospitality be granted for an early evening reception and that arrangements be 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 an early evening reception and that arrangements 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) Annual Reception for Volunteers**

It was proposed that the City Corporation host a reception for volunteers on 22 March 2021. This annual reception provided an opportunity to thank individuals who gave up their time voluntarily for the City Corporation and would have particular importance next year given the high level of volunteering in relation to the COVID pandemic. The event would take place in a manner that was consistent with any COVID-related restrictions that might be in place.

It was **recommended** that hospitality be granted for an early evening reception and that arrangements be 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 an early evening reception and that arrangements are made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash within agreed parameters.

#### **(c) London Sport Awards 2021**

It was proposed that the City Corporation host an evening reception and dinner at Guildhall on 14 May 2021 as part of the London Sport Awards 2021. Following consultation between the City Corporation and London Sport, it was proposed that next year's London Sport awards ceremony take place at Guildhall and that the City Corporation host the reception and dinner element of the event. The event would provide an opportunity to demonstrate the City Corporation's commitment to grassroots sport and physical activity.

It was **recommended** that hospitality be granted for the London Sports Awards 2021 and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Policy and Resources Committee; the costs to be met from City's cash and within the agreed parameters.

*Resolved* – That hospitality be granted for the London Sports Awards 2021 and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Policy and Resources Committee; the costs to be met from City's cash and within the agreed parameters.

#### **(d) High Sheriffs' Association of England and Wales Reception**

It was proposed that the City Corporation host an early evening reception in the Grand Hall of the Old Bailey for the High Sheriffs' Association of England and Wales in May 2021. The City Corporation had hosted an annual reception for the High Sheriffs' Association at the Old Bailey since 2018. The reception aimed to further relations between the Sheriffs of the City of London and the High Sheriffs of England and Wales.

It was **recommended** that hospitality be granted for an early evening reception and that arrangements be 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 an early evening reception and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's cash and within the agreed parameters.

#### **(e) Central London Bench Reception**

It was proposed that the City Corporation hosts an early evening reception in the Grand Hall at the Old Bailey for the Central London Bench in June 2021. The City Corporation had hosted an annual reception for the Central London Bench at the Old Bailey since 2018. The reception aimed to further relations between the City of London Corporation and the Central London Bench.

It was **recommended** that hospitality be granted for an early evening reception and that arrangements are made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's cash within agreed parameters.

*Resolved* – That hospitality be granted for an early evening reception and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's cash within the agreed parameters.

18. *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:-**

19. *Resolved* – That the non-public minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.
20. **Policy and Resources Committee**  
The Court approved proposals in relation to the redevelopment of Bastion House.
21. **City of London Police Authority Board**  
The Court approved an extension to the Commissioner of the City Police's appointment.
22. **Property Investment Board**  
The Court noted action taken under urgency procedures in respect of:  
(A) a freehold purchase; and  
(B) a major property refurbishment.
23. **Policy and Resources Committee**  
Additional Item The Court approved proposals in relation to employment matters.

**The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and ended at 4.05 pm**

**BARRADELL.**