

PLEASE BRING THIS AGENDA WITH YOU

1

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, held through **MICROSOFT TEAMS**, on **THURSDAY** next, the **14th day of January, 2021**.

Members of the public can observe this virtual public meeting at the below link:

<https://youtu.be/GP8Rztxcofc>

This meeting will be a virtual meeting and therefore will not take place in a physical location following regulations made under Section 78 of the Coronavirus Act 2020. A recording of the public meeting will be available via the above link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

JOHN BARRADELL,
Town Clerk & Chief Executive.

Guildhall

Sir Alan Yarrow

David Graves

}

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 3 December 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 1 - 18)

4 **Mayoral Visits**

The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor to report on his recent engagements.

5 **Policy Statement**

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

6 **Policy and Resources Committee**

To consider proposals in relation to the Standards Regime and Lord Lisvane's recommendations thereon through his review of the City Corporation's governance arrangements.

For Decision
(Pages 19 - 44)

7 **Planning and Transportation Committee**

To consider revisions to the City Plan 2036.

For Decision
(Pages 45 - 96)

8 **Standards Committee**

To consider proposals relating to the terms of appointment for Independent Persons.

For Decision
(Pages 97 - 100)

9 **Hospitality Working Party of the Policy and Resources Committee**

To consider recommendations concerning the provision of hospitality.

For Decision
(Pages 101 - 102)

10 **Appointments**

To consider the following appointments:-

- (A) Two Members on the **Education Board**, for the balance of terms expiring in April 2021 and April 2024.

Nominations received:-

Tijs Broeke

Alderman Robert Picton Seymour Howard

- (B) One Member on **Christ's Hospital**, for a term expiring in March 2024.

Nominations received:-

Tijs Broeke

For Decision

11 **The Freedom of the City**

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

For Decision
(Pages 103 - 106)

12 **Motions**

By Deputy Andrien Gereith Dominic Meyers

"That Doug Barrow be appointed to the Planning and Transportation Committee for the Ward of Aldgate, in the room of Sylvia Doreen Moys?"

For Decision

13 **Questions**

14 **Policy and Resources and Finance Committees**

To note action taken under urgency procedures in relation to delegations concerning write-off limits and discretionary Business Rates relief.

For Information
(Pages 107 - 108)

15 **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 109 - 112)

16 **Docquets for the Hospital Seal**

17 **Awards and Prizes**

18 **Resolutions on Retirements, Congratulatory Resolutions, Memorials**

To consider congratulatory resolutions in respect of the recent award of honours.

For Decision
(Pages 113 - 114)

MOTION

19 **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 Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

For Decision

20 **Non-Public Minutes**

To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting of the Court held on 3 December 2020.

For Decision
(Pages 115 - 118)

21 **Policy and Resources Committee**

To consider proposals in relation to the Markets Co-location Programme.

For Decision
(Pages 119 - 166)

22 **Property Investment Board**

To note two reports of the Property Investment Board, advising of action taken under urgency procedures, as follows:-

- (A) **Report of Action Taken: Alfred Place** – to note action taken under urgency procedures in respect of the surrender and re-grant of two long-term leases.

For Information
(Pages 167 - 168)

- (B) **Report of Action Taken: Brewery Road** – to note action taken under urgency procedures in respect of the purchase of a long leasehold.

For Information
(Pages 169 - 170)



RUSSELL, MAYOR

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

3rd December 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT

ALDERMEN

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
Vincent Thomas Keaveny
Alastair John Naisbitt King
Susan Langley
Ian David Luder

Nicholas Stephen Leland Lyons
Sheriff Professor Michael Raymond Mainelli
Bronek Masojada
Sir Andrew Charles Parmley
The Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor, William Anthony Bowater Russell
Sir David Hugh Wootton
Sir Alan Colin Drake Yarrow

COMMONERS

George Christopher Abrahams
Deputy John David Absalom
Caroline Kordai Addy
Munsur Ali
Rehana Banu Ameer
Randall Keith Anderson
Alexander Robertson Martin Barr
Douglas Barrow
Matthew Bell
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
Karina Dostalova
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
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 Ashanti Joshi
Angus Knowles-Cutler
Tim Levene
Vivienne Littlechild
Oliver Arthur Wynlayne Lodge
Deputy Edward Lord
Paul Nicholas Martinelli
Andrew Paul Mayer
Jeremy Mayhew
Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Andrew Stratton McMurtrie
Wendy Mead
Deputy Robert Allan Merrett
Deputy Andrien Gereith Dominic Meyers
Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney
Hugh Fenton Morris
Alastair Michael Moss
Barbara Patricia Newman
Graham Packham
Susan Jane Pearson

John Petrie
William Pimlott
Judith Pleasance
Deputy James Henry George Pollard
Jason Paul Pritchard
Stephen Douglas Quilter
Deputy Elizabeth Rogula
James de Sausmarez
Ruby Sayed
John George Stewart Scott
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
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.

4. Mayoral Visits The Rt Hon the Lord Mayor took the opportunity to update the Court on his virtual engagement programme.

5. Policy Statement There was no statement.

6. **FINANCE COMMITTEE**

(Jeremy Paul Mayhew)

13 October 2020

Resetting of Departmental Budgets 2020/21

The Court was **recommended** to approve a series of proposals arising from an in-year re-budgeting exercise, intended to assist in repairing the damage to the City's budgets arising from the COVID-19 pandemic. This was considered to be a vital step in ensuring that the City Corporation put its finances on a sustainable footing for the medium term.

The Chairman spoke to introduce the report, noting that the impact of COVID-19 stood at just over £28m in 2020/21 and that, whilst the City expected to recover an estimated £13.6m from the Government's compensation scheme, the remaining deficit would need to come from reserves. He outlined the process by which the re-budgeting exercise had been progressed and urged Members to support the proposals.

In response to a query, the Chairman undertook to have a copy of his introductory speech circulated to Members for information.

Resolved – That:-

1. The steps already taken to reduce the financial impact of the COVID-19 pandemic be noted.
2. The adjusted departmental budgets totalling £14.2m be approved outlined in the report, including a downward revision of £1m for the Barbican explained at paragraph 7 and a reduction of £400k to the original proposal for the Open Spaces Department explained at paragraph 9.
3. Proposals to continue working with departments to identify further savings where possible be approved.
4. The continuation of recruitment controls aligned to the Target Operating Model (TOM) be approved, noting these may give further savings in the year.

7. **PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

(Deputy Alastair Michael Moss)

15 October 2020

Gateway 4b: Bank Junction Improvements Project: All Change at Bank

Approval was sought at Gateway 4b to progress the 'All Change at Bank' Bank Junction Improvements project. The project aimed to improve the safety, air quality and pedestrian experience of the area around the Bank junction and reflect the historic and iconic surroundings with the appropriate sense of place. The project

enacted the City of London Corporation's longer-term ambitions for the junction and was a product of the Bank Area Enhancement Strategy agreed by the Court of Common Council in May 2013.

The Chair spoke to introduce the report, reminding Members of the genesis of the project, summarising the proposals before the Court, and setting out the timescales for future activity, including the public consultation process in 2021. He also addressed the interaction with temporary road layout amendments associated with the Covid-19 response.

During discussion, a Member spoke to express their concern as to the closure of Threadneedle Street and the knock-on impact on Broad Street and the surrounding area, challenging the general move to restrict traffic movements particularly in the current context. The Chair noted that the City's Transport Strategy prioritised pedestrian movements and that there were also health and safety and air quality considerations informing decisions; however, all steps were being managed in such a way as to take other road users into consideration, recognising the need to ensure that traffic could still move through efficiently where required.

Responding to several Members' queries in relation to consultation and engagement with local businesses, the Chair agreed with the importance of this and advised that a full consultation process with all businesses and stakeholders would be progressed during the coming year. With reference to a particular concern regarding disabled access, the Chair provided assurances that the views of disabled user groups, including the City Access Group, would be a key part of the process.

In response to several queries in relation to the possibility of providing a taxi-rank outside the NED, the Chair advised that there would remain a step-free access and drop-off point on Princes Street and that discussions with the NED were ongoing as to the possibility of a rank on Poultry.

Resolved – That the progression of project be approved past Gateway 4b, noting:-

1. The intention to submit a Gateway 5 in September/October 2021.
2. That Design Option 1 would be taken forward to detailed design stage (the closure of Threadneedle Street and further restriction of Queen Victoria Street and Princes Street).
3. That further investigation into permitting general traffic on the 'open arms' during the current restricted hours would not be carried forward for further investigation.
4. The cost of £541,935 to reach the next gateway, giving a cumulative approved budget of £1,923,410 after allowing for the underspend to date of £201,983.
5. That funding for this budget would be partially met from unspent S106 deposits arising from the underspend to date, with the balance of £339,953 to be drawn down from the central funding agreed in principle via the 2020/21 annual capital bid process.

6. The total estimated cost of the project at £5.0m - £5.7 million.
7. The approved Costed Risk Provision of £95,000 (to be drawn down via delegation to Chief Officer).
8. That the Gateway 4c Detailed Design report and all further decisions on reports would be delegated for approval via the Streets and Walkways and Projects Sub Committees.

8.

BARBICAN CENTRE BOARD

(Deputy Tom Sleight)

11 November 2020

Barbican Centre Board: Review of Composition and Terms of Reference

The Barbican Centre Board had recently considered its governance arrangements with a view to determining whether or not they remained fit for purpose, or where improvements might be achieved. This was of particular salience for the Barbican given the challenging circumstances arising from the COVID-19 outbreak, together with other emerging challenges affecting the cultural sector more generally.

Following its deliberations, the Board now wished to progress changes to:

- its composition and, in particular, its ability to increase the external expertise available to it (by two additional individuals);
- its own rules in relation to term limits, where a lack of clarity had become apparent (applying a consistent nine-year limit on membership); and,
- a minor amendment to the Board's Terms of Reference, to reflect better the Barbican's creative learning activities and the Board's oversight thereof.

These recommendations had been considered and supported by the Policy & Resources Committee at its November 2020 meeting.

It was noted that the outcomes of Lord Lisvane's comprehensive Governance Review would also reflect on the Barbican Board's governance. The Board's proposals at this stage were intended to be complementary to any Barbican-specific recommendations that emerged from Members' wider consideration of that Review over the longer-term, facilitating the effective implementation of proposals within the context of the Barbican's current needs, whilst also taking into account best practice across the arts sector and comparator institutions.

Resolved – That approval be granted in respect of:

1. An alteration to the composition of the Barbican Centre Board, to allow for two additional external Members (see paragraphs 5-11).
2. The consistent application of a nine-year term limit across the Barbican Centre Board's membership, applying to all Members (see paragraphs 12-20).
3. A clarification in respect of the Board's Terms of Reference in relation to the Barbican's creative learning activities (see paragraphs 21-27).
4. The consequent amendments to the Constitution and Terms of Reference as set out at Appendix 1.

9.
Committee
Appointments

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

- (A) One Member on **the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2021.

Nominations received:-

Andrew Paul Mayer

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Andrew Mayer to be appointed to the Board of Governors of the Guildhall School of Music & Drama of Andrew Mayer, for a term expiring April 2021.

- (B) Seven Members on the **Community & Children's Services Committee**, for the balance of terms expiring in April 2021.

Nominations received:-

Deputy Keith David Forbes Bottomley

Tijs Broeke

Sheriff Christopher Michael Hayward

Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark

Deputy Elizabeth Rogula

Sir Michael Snyder

Dawn Lindsay Wright

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Deputy Keith Bottomley, Tijs Broeke, Sheriff Christopher Hayward, Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark, Deputy Elizabeth Rogula, Sir Michael Snyder and Dawn Wright to be appointed to Community & Children's Services Committee, for the balance of terms expiring in April 2021.

- (C) Two Members on the **Health & Social Care Scrutiny Committee**, for the balance of terms expiring April 2021.

Nominations received:-

Andrew Paul Mayer

Barbara Newman, C.B.E.*

**NB – Barbara Newman had been appointed to the Committee under urgency procedures on 2 November, following e-mail consultation of the Court and in advance of the Committee's November meeting, in order to assist with quoracy concerns.*

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Andrew Mayer and Barbara Newman to be appointed to the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Committee for the balance of terms expiring in April 2021.

- (D) One Member on the **Standards Appeals Committee**, for the balance of terms expiring in April 2021.

Nominations received:-

Alderman Gregory Percy Jones, Q.C.

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Alderman Gregory Jones Q.C. to be appointed to the Standards Appeal Committee for the balance of a term expiring in April 2021.

- (E) Two Members on **Christ's Hospital**, for terms expiring in March 2024 and June 2024.

Nominations received:-

Deputy Dr Giles Robert Evelyn Shilson

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Deputy Dr Giles Shilson to be appointed to Christ's Hospital for a term expiring in June 2024.

10. **Freedom of the City** 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.

Abdal Uddin Ahmed <i>Munsur Ali, CC</i> <i>Rehana Banu Ameer, CC</i>	a School Games Organiser <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	Limehouse, London
Asad Aamir Ansari <i>Ald. Prof. & Sheriff Michael</i> <i>Raymond Mainelli</i> <i>Mark Raymond Peter Wheatley</i>	an Operations Director and Consultant <i>Citizen and World Trader</i> <i>Citizen and Draper</i>	Loughborough, Leicestershire
Suneel Bakhshi <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Ald. Sir Roger Gifford, Kt.</i>	a Banker <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Holland Park, London
Jessica Jane Bates <i>James Nicholas Bromiley-Davis</i> <i>Ald. Emma Edhem</i>	a Jeweller <i>Citizen and Gardener</i> <i>Citizen and Woolman</i>	Penge, London
Lt. Col. Christopher Colin Stephen Booth <i>Geoffrey Charles Bond</i> <i>Col. Anthony William King- Harman, CBE</i>	a Livery Company Clerk <i>Citizen and Glazier</i> <i>Citizen and Merchant Taylor</i>	Farnham, Surrey
David Bulbrook <i>Donald William Randall, MBE</i>	a Fire Brigade Borough Commander <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	Bexleyheath, Kent

<i>Graham Bassett</i>	<i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	
Jason Charles Burgoin <i>Michele McCarthy</i> <i>John A Welch</i>	a Canadian Army Officer <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
John Stefan Burmicz <i>Alan Leslie Warman</i> <i>Diane Irene Warman</i>	a Company Director <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Sawbridgeworth, Hertfordshire
Stephen Peter Cleary <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Civil Servant <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire
James Dominic Edward Close <i>The Rt Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Chartered Accountant <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Harrow on the Hill, London
Anthony Richard Grenville Cowland <i>Graham George Cooke</i> <i>Hugh Stuart Stucley Trotter, DFC</i>	an Artist, Designer and Photographer <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	Wadhurst, East Sussex
Ann Elizabeth Farquharson <i>Michael Peter Cawston</i> <i>Colin Trevor Gurnett</i>	a Barrister <i>Citizen and Tyler & Bricklayer</i> <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	Ontario, Canada
Alison Mary Kent Gordon <i>Alan Leslie Warman</i> <i>Diane Irene Warman</i>	a Company Secretary, retired <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire
John Malcolm Gordon <i>Alan Leslie Warman</i> <i>Diane Irene Warman</i>	a Mechanical Engineering Company Director, retired <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire
Katherine Helen Greig <i>The Rt Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Senior Transition Specialist <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Chelsea, London
Adrienne Rita Harper <i>Wesley Gavin Harper</i> <i>Yasmeen Stratton</i>	a Livery Company Clerk <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i> <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	North Warnborough, Hampshire
John Anthony Helliwell <i>The Rt Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Musician <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Newbiggin, Carnforth, Cumbria
Dr Patrick William Jordan <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Researcher and Advisor <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Butleigh, Somerset
Million Joseph <i>Colin Trevor Gurnett</i> <i>Geoffrey Gray Lunn</i>	a Mental Health Service Manager <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Islington, London

Klaus Roderick Kaiser <i>John Alexander Smail</i> <i>Dorothy Newlands of Lauriston</i>	a Real Estate Company Chairman <i>Citizen and Distiller</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Loughborough, Leicestershire
Perry Keena <i>Scott Marcus Longman</i> <i>Garry Wykes</i>	a Financial Consultant <i>Citizen and Educator</i> <i>Citizen and Joiner & Ceiler</i>	Maidenhead, Berkshire
Sam Perry Keena <i>Scott Marcus Longman</i> <i>Garry Wykes</i>	an Independent Mortgage Consultant <i>Citizen and Educator</i> <i>Citizen and Joiner & Ceiler</i>	Surbiton, Surrey
Helene Kay Koot <i>Michael Peter Cawston</i> <i>Colin Trevor Gurnett</i>	a Hotel Manager <i>Citizen and Tyler & Bricklayer</i> <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Richard Joseph Logue <i>David O'Reilly</i> <i>Richard Evans</i>	a Project Management Consultant <i>Citizen and Educator</i> <i>Citizen and Educator</i>	Mill Hill, London
Pamela Jane Magill <i>Dr Lesley Patricia Muriel Taor</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Astley-Cooper</i> <i>Eggar</i>	a School Receptionist, retired <i>Citizen and Art Scholar</i> <i>Citizen and Educator</i>	Edgbaston, Birmingham
Dawn Allison McCafferty <i>Gilbert Aubrey Singleton</i> <i>John James Tunesi of Liongam,</i> <i>The Younger</i>	a Royal Air Force Officer, retired <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	St Blazey, Cornwall
Jordan Michael David Meade <i>Ald. Prof. & Sheriff Michael</i> <i>Raymond Mainelli</i> <i>Elisabeth Mainelli</i>	a Senior Policy Advisor and Councillor <i>Citizen and World Trader</i> <i>Citizen and Mason</i>	Gravesend, Kent
Air Vice Marshal Ian Craig Morrison, CBE <i>Air Commodore Richard Skene</i> <i>Peacock-Edwards, CBE AFC</i> <i>Air Marshal Clifford Rodney</i> <i>Spink, CB CBE</i>	a Royal Air Force Officer, retired <i>Citizen and Air Pilot and Air</i> <i>Navigator</i> <i>Citizen and Air Pilot</i>	Heacham, Norfolk
Fiyaz Akhtar Mughal, OBE <i>Mark Raymond Peter Wheatley</i> <i>Ald. Emma Edhem</i>	a Director <i>Citizen and Draper</i> <i>Citizen & Woolman</i>	Wood Green, London
Norman Hugh Savill <i>Deputy Catherine Sidony</i> <i>McGuinness</i> <i>Sir David Wootton, Kt., Ald.</i>	a Trade Association Director of Regulation <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i>	Navestock, Essex
The Hon. David Louis Taylor <i>The Rt Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Civil Servant <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Clapham, London
Paul Stuart Thompson	a Management Accountant,	Frinton-on-Sea, Essex

<i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	retired <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	
Michael Matthew Wall <i>Geoffrey Douglas Ellis</i> <i>Garry Wykes</i>	a Hotel General Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Joiner</i> <i>Citizen and Joiner & Ceiler</i>	Sheffield, South Yorkshire
David Geoffrey Ward <i>Donald William Randall, MBE</i> <i>Graham Bassett</i>	a Security Company Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i> <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	Gillingham, Kent
Kevin Allen Webber, BEM <i>The Rt Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Bank Manager <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Epsom, Surrey
Antony Wong <i>Deputy Catherine Sidony</i> <i>McGuinness</i> <i>Jeremy Lewis Simons, CC</i>	a Dental Surgeon, retired <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and Scientific Instrument</i> <i>Maker</i>	St John's Wood, London
Prof. Christopher Barry Wood <i>Ald. Sir Andrew Charles Parmley</i> <i>Jonathan Patterson Shiels</i>	a Chief Medical Officer <i>Citizen and Musician</i> <i>Citizen and Joiner & Ceiler</i>	Highcliffe, Dorset
Rume Zahan <i>Munsur Ali, CC</i> <i>Rehana Banu Ameer, CC</i>	a National Health Service Patient Access Officer <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	Stepney, London

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.

11. Questions

Lodge, O.A.W.,
to the Chair of
the Policy &
Resources
Committee

Competitive environment for captive insurance companies

Oliver Lodge asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee concerning the provision of a competitive environment for captive insurance companies.

Responding, the Chair advised that she was speaking regularly to the CEO and Chair of the London Markets Group (LMG), who were leading and co-ordinating industry efforts to build the onshore captive insurance market. The LMG had had constructive recent meetings with HM Treasury and the Financial Conduct Authority on this issue, including with Ministers, and would be consulting the industry shortly with a view to submitting formal proposals for the legislative and statutory changes required to build the captive insurance market. This would be in the context of Government's consultations on the future of the Solvency II regime.

She added that the LMG had welcomed the City Corporation's interest and offers of future support on this issue and had indicated that they were happy with the current direction and pace of travel with Government.

Oliver Lodge asked a supplementary question, concerning the City Corporation's role as the principal supporter of the Financial and Professional Services (FPS) sector and the need to involve Members more effectively in the creation of an economic development strategy, with a view to ensuring the City remained the most attractive domain for FPS businesses.

The Chair agreed that the City Corporation should focus on making the City as competitive and attractive as possible and suggested that this was achieved most effectively by listening to what the sector needed and ensuring this was reflected clearly and practically to Government, where the City Corporation was aligned. In this particular instance, LMG was taking the lead and doing just this, so she suggested it would be most appropriate for the City Corporation to support them in this work. In relation to a query concerning the City's own captive insurance arrangements, she advised that this would be a matter for the Finance Committee.

Alderwoman Sue Langley asked a supplementary question, seeking clarity on the international element in supporting insurance and how the City Corporation was helping London win new business and stay competitive. She also queried the impact of Brexit on insurance, particularly in relation to the shape of post-Brexit regulation, and what the City Corporation was doing in this area.

In reply, the Chair noted that the London market was a truly global one, with more commercial business now written in London from the US and Canada than from the UK and Ireland. As such, securing and maintaining investment would be crucial for the future. The US was the key partner in this respect and the role of the dominant US brokers Aon and Marsh in bringing US and global business to London was central to the City's competitiveness. The Chair outlined the regular engagement with Aon and Marsh, as well as the relationships with other US and European firms who were important investors in both the London market and the retail sector. Further afield, through the Lord Mayor's programme, the City supported UK retail firms such as Prudential, Aviva and BUPA build their business in China and other developing markets in Asia, Africa and the Gulf.

With reference to the impact of Brexit on the London market, the Chair suggested that this was likely to be mixed. Lloyd's had established a new platform in Brussels and were confident that Brexit would have limited impact on their volumes and business models; however, for the non-Lloyd's market, it must be acknowledged that firms needed to plan for no-deal and that business had been lost, with nearly 60% of EU premiums previously written in London having returned to local markets. However, this had been compensated to some degree by gains in new business from other markets, including indeed from European investors in London building their non-EU business in the US and elsewhere. An equivalence regime, which the City Corporation continued to press for, would help stabilise and regrow the remaining EU business and retain EU investment in the London Market. The Corporation was speaking regularly to the Association of British Insurers (ABI) about the challenges that Brexit posed for the UK retail sector.

The Chair also referenced the Chancellor's intended full-scale review of Solvency II, the EU Directive covering insurance which formed the basis of the current UK regulatory regime, advising that the ABI and major UK retail firms had requested

reform of several aspects. For Lloyd's and the London Market the priority would be to keep close enough to the EU's evolving regime to maintain equivalence.

Replying to a supplementary question from Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark, the Chair agreed with the principle that building a strong market in the UK for captive insurance would require a competitive environment, with the right coverage and technical support available at the right price. With reference to the City Re captive, she noted that this had been established by the Finance Committee and any decision to move it from Guernsey to London would be made by that Committee.

In response to an additional supplementary question from Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark on linking insurance to the City Corporation's work on green finance and COP26, the Chair noted that insurance firms had large volumes of data and expertise about climate modelling, including the financial risks for business and communities through climate change. The City Corporation was looking to integrate that expertise into the workstreams leading towards COP26 in Glasgow, whilst also working with insurance firms as major asset managers to transition their asset allocation towards Environmental, Social and Governance) principles, underpinned by the Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures.

The Chair added that the City was also working with the Department for International Trade on a virtual Resilience Summit to take place in March, followed by a face-to-face event later in the year on the road to COP26. This would focus on the role insurance can play building climate resilience, especially for vulnerable communities.

Planning process review

Graeme Harrower asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee in relation to a recent planning application concerning 150 Aldersgate, urging that the decision be referred to the Court and also calling for a wider review of the planning process. This was particularly in view of the fact that the City Corporation was the freeholder of 150 Aldersgate but that the Corporation's financial interest in the outcome of the application had not been disclosed in the report presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee.

The Chair opposed the implication that the application had been considered on an improper basis, observing that redevelopment by long leaseholders of City Corporation freehold property was very common and that, where there were such planning applications submitted by long leaseholders, the City Corporation's freehold interest was not a material planning consideration. Therefore, the Planning and Transportation Committee could not lawfully take it into account and this was why this type of interest had not been included in the report presented to the Committee. She expressed reservations as to whether doing so in future would be lawful and noted that it would be unhelpful to tell the Committee of an irrelevant fact, only to then tell them they must disregard it. However, she undertook to speak further with the Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee and relevant officers on this issue.

Having looked at the legal advice, the weight of documentation presented to the Committee, and length of time given to discussion of the application, she was

Harrower, G.G.,
to the Chair of
the Policy &
Resources
Committee

satisfied that the planning process had been followed fully. She added that the Planning and Transportation Committee would be looked at as part of the Lisvane Review and Members would have the opportunity to make their views known there.

Graeme Harrower asked a supplementary question, in which he advanced the role of protocols and procedures in raising standards above the minimum threshold required by the law and asked the Chair to recognise that the City Corporation should aspire to meet a higher threshold, thereby obtaining public confidence. Replying, the Chair did not accept that the current planning processes were deficient, noting there was a detailed planning protocol with careful advice and she had every confidence in the Planning and Transportation Committee's application of the proper processes.

A supplementary question was asked by Tijs Broeke, who suggested that it would be helpful for those Members who did not serve on the Planning and Transportation Committee to be provided with a better understanding of the process and extent of deliberations in relation to the planning application in question. Through a second supplementary question, he also sought clarity as to the paperwork and information provided to Members ahead of decision-making. Responding, the Chair advised that the Committee first heard from officers who presented the scheme in detail, then from five objectors, following which the committee members had a chance to ask questions of the objectors. The applicant then addressed the Committee and answered several questions of Members. The Committee then moved to ask questions of officers and express views in relation to the application, before a motion to move to the vote was put, seconded and approved by a majority of the committee. Upon the substantive motion then being put, the Committee resolved by majority to grant planning consent. The Committee had been considering the item for over 1 hour and 40 minutes when it was put for decision. The Chair also confirmed that the report for pre-reading was 281 pages long, with additional letters also circulated to the committee.

Through two supplementary questions, Marianne Fredericks suggested that it was the substance rather than the length of debate that was important, highlighting that the termination of debate was precipitate and prevented proper questions to and answers from planning officers, adding that there had also been interruptions and delays caused by technical issues. She sought the Chair's view on a wholesale review of the Corporation's planning processes, which she argued was imperative to restore public confidence and to address Lord Lisvane's observations of deficiencies through his recent review. In reply, the Chair commented that the planning protocol had only recently been reviewed and updated and reiterated her confidence in the City's processes and in the Planning and Transportation Committee. Whilst accepting the importance of restoring confidence to any regime where it was lacking, she cautioned that this was a highly regulated area and concerns should be addressed in the proper way through the Lisvane Review process. She added that she would be happy to meet with concerned Members in meantime to discuss particular issues.

Alderman Prem Goyal asked two additional supplementary questions in relation to the City's Planning Protocol and the particularly salient elements of it, asking in particular what elements had been recently updated to ensure full compliance with

good practice and the law. The Chair provided a summary of the Protocol in response to indicate its comprehensive nature and which, along with planning law, allowed the City to discharge its functions in a fair, effective and lawful manner. She added that the Planning Protocol ran to 24 pages of rules and regulations, all of which were designed to ensure the highest standards of conduct and probity at all times, adding that it had been updated only recently following debate and approval by both the Policy and Resources Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee in the light of the Holocaust Memorial judgement and also to make any member meetings with applicants, objectors or other stakeholders even more tightly regulated, so as to preserve trust in the planning system.

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

Motion – That, pursuant to Standing Order No.2, Standing Orders No.13(6) and 13(9) be suspended to allow for debate to continue.

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

12. Motions There were no motions.

13. **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)

27 October 2020

Report of Urgent Action Taken: Markets Co-location Programme, Interim Budget

At its meeting on 22 October 2020, the Policy & Resources Committee had considered a report on the Markets Co-location Programme (MCP), which updated on the project's development and outlined progress towards submission of a Private Bill in November 2020 to move the City of London Corporation's three wholesale markets to Dagenham Dock. Members agreed that it was of paramount importance that the Private Bill be laid before Parliament at the optimal time and with supporting evidence which maximised the chances of achieving Royal Assent. In view of the Programme's position at that time, the view was taken that it was not sufficiently well progressed to submit the Private Bill in November 2020 and it was agreed to delay submission by one year until November 2021, thereby providing a period in which to address a number of outstanding issues.

Noting that the previously approved budget for running the Programme was due to expire at the end of November 2020, support was granted for interim funding to allow requisite activities to be progressed and for work to continue, in view of the delay. Specifically, this was to allow for outline planning to be completed to achieve planning permission supported by a legal agreement to the terms of the s106 agreement, and to fund the Programme team until the end of January 2021, whilst a detailed budget report for funding in 2021 was drafted for submission in December 2020.

The sum total of this interim funding amounted to £779,000, to be funded from City's Cash Reserves. The approval of the Court was required to allow for these funds to be drawn down. As the Court of Common Council was not due to meet until December 2020, in order to allow for work to be progressed and a revised business case submitted for that month's meeting of the Policy and Resources

Committee, a decision was sought and obtained under urgency procedures.

Resolved – That the action taken under urgency procedures be noted.

14.

PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

(Deputy Alastair Michael Moss)

2 November 2020

Report of Urgent Action Taken: Gateway 4b – Tower Bridge High Voltage System Replacement and Increasing Resilience

The Court noted urgent action taken in relation to a project involving the refurbishment of the High Voltage (HV) and Low Voltage (LV) electrical infrastructure at Tower Bridge. This project was at a critical stage and the refurbishment of electrical equipment was necessary as a matter of urgency, as the current electrical network and switchgear was 20 years beyond its design life and the existing secondary supply could only power bridge-lifts at half speed. This affected the ability to complete bridge lifts as covered under the Corporation of London (Tower Bridge) Act 1885.

The approval of the Court was required to proceed at Gateway 4b given that the overall cost of the project (£8.4m) was in excess of £5m. Provision had been made within the Bridge House Estate maintenance plan for all budget requested to progress this project (i.e. no new monies were being requested). Approval was, therefore, granted under urgency to proceed with the project and progress to Gateway 4c, the Detailed Design stage). Approval of the project and any associated amendments at Gateway 4c and Gateway 5 stages was also delegated to the Planning & Transportation and Projects (Policy & Resources) Sub-Committee.

Resolved – That the action taken under urgency procedures be noted.

15.

Resolutions

There were no resolutions.

16.

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

Corporate Insolvency and Governance Act 2020 (Coronavirus) (Extension of the Relevant Period) Regulations 2020 No. 1031

29 September 2020

These Regulations extend the temporary measures of the Corporate Insolvency and Governance Act 2020, which aim to mitigate the financial impact of the Coronavirus and which were due to expire on 30th September. The Regulations extend until 31 December 2020 a suspension on serving statutory demands and restrictions on filing petitions to wind up companies. They also extend until 30 March 2021 the temporary moratorium rules, which allow a company subject to a winding-up petition to access a moratorium simply by filing the relevant documents in court, rather than having to make an application to court. The

regulations also disapply the rule that prevents a company from entering a moratorium if it has been subject to a company voluntary arrangement, been in administration, or been in a previous moratorium within the past 12 months. Further, the Regulations extend until 30 March 2021 the Act's small supplier exemption from termination clause provisions. Subsequent SI No. 1033 provides that some of the provisions relating to the temporary moratorium rules cease to have effect on 1st October 2020, but this does not apply in relation to a moratorium which came into force, or for which an application was made to the court, before 1st October 2020.

The Air Quality (Domestic Solid Fuels Standards) (England) Regulations 2020 No. 1095 1 May 2021

These regulations make it an offence to supply less than two cubic metres of wood for the purposes of combustion in domestic premises in England, unless the wood is authorised by an "approved wood certification body". They also make it an offence to supply wood in units of two cubic metres or more without an accompanying notice that it is not suitable for burning until it has a moisture content of 20% or less. Further offences are created for the supply a manufactured solid fuel that is not an authorised fuel under these Regulations, and the supply of coal that is not exempted. A person who commits any of these offences may be issued with a fixed penalty of £300. These Regulations are to be enforced by the relevant local authority, which may include the Common Council depending on the circumstances of the supply of the fuel. The local authority may recover the expenses reasonably incurred by it in enforcing these Regulations from a person in respect of whom it has taken any action under these Regulations.

The Value Added Tax (Refund of Tax to Museums and Galleries) (Amendment) Order 2020 No. 1167 17 November 2020

Section 33A of the Value Added Tax Act 1994 entitles bodies to claim a refund of the VAT incurred by them that is attributable to the provision of free admission to specified museums and galleries which they operate. The Museum of London is one such specified museum. This Order amends the postcode for "Museum of London, London Wall London", to "EC2Y 5HN" from "EC2Y 5NH". It also omits "Museum of London Archaeological Service Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London N1", as a relevant museum, and inserts "Museum of London, Site bound by Charterhouse Street, East Poultry Avenue, Smithfield Street, Snowhill, Farringdon, London EC1*".

The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England) (No. 4) Regulations 2020 No. 1200 5 November 2020

These Regulations impose restrictions on the occasions on which a person can leave or be outside of the place where they are living and on both indoor and outdoor gatherings. There are a number of exceptions, for example with respect to people from the same or linked households. The Regulations also require the closure of businesses such as bars and pubs, and impose restrictions on businesses, such as prohibiting the sale of food or

drink for consumption on premises. The regulations expire on 2 December 2020.

The Local Authorities (Collection Fund: Surplus and Deficit) (Coronavirus) (England) Regulations 2020 No. 1202 1 December 2020

These Regulations amend existing provisions for the discharge by a billing authority of liabilities to meet any estimated surplus or deficit in that billing authority's collection fund, and provide that liabilities for a negative exceptional balance for the financial year beginning on 1st April 2021 can be met over a period of three years. The Regulations amend the way in which billing authorities calculate their estimated surplus or deficit on their collection fund in respect of non-domestic rating income for the relevant years beginning on 1st April 2021 and 1st April 2022. In calculating its exceptional balance, the Regulations require a billing authority to estimate the amount of rates relief it awarded in the preceding year in accordance with guidance issued by the MHCLG and the Treasury. The Regulations apply to the City of London as is a billing authority.

The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No. 1212 29 November 2020

These Regulations amend existing provisions concerning the accounting practices to be followed by local authorities, including (in particular) with respect to the charging of expenditure to revenue accounts. The Regulations provide that, where a local authority has a deficit on its school budget, the authority must not charge any such deficit to its revenue account, but rather to a separate account, established and usable solely for that purpose. The Regulations apply to accounts prepared for the financial years beginning in 2020, 2021 and 2022, and provides formulae for calculating whether a local authority has a schools budget deficit in relation to each such financial year.

The Public Health (Coronavirus) (Protection from Eviction and Taking Control of Goods) (England) Regulations 2020 No. 1290 17 November 2020

These Regulations prevent attendance at a dwelling house for the purpose of executing a writ or warrant of possession or restitution or delivering a notice of eviction, except where the court is satisfied that the claim is against trespassers who are persons unknown or where it was made wholly or partly on the grounds of anti-social behaviour, nuisance, false statements, substantial rent arrears that predate 23rd March 2020 or, in cases where the person attending is satisfied that the dwelling house is unoccupied at the time of attendance, death of the occupant. This provision expires on 11th January 2021. The Regulations also prevent use of the procedure set out in the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 to take control of goods located inside a dwelling house, until the expiry of the Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England) (No. 4) Regulations 2020.

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

17. Hospital Seal There were no docquets for the Seal.
18. Awards & Prizes There was no report.
19. Mooney, B.D.F., Deputy; Mayhew, J.P. *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 the Local Government Act, 1972.
- Summary of exempt items considered whilst the public were excluded:-**
20. *Resolved* – That the non-public minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.
21. **Establishment Committee**
The Court approved proposals in relation to the Target Operating Model.
22. **Finance Committee**
The Court:-
- (A) noted action taken under urgency in respect of a contract variation associated with sexual health e-services; and
 - (B) noted action taken under urgency in respect of the award of a contract for energy and gas supplies.
23. **Property Investment Board**
The Court noted action taken under urgency procedures in relation to the refurbishment of a property.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and ended at 2.20 pm

BARRADELL.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – Policy and Resources Committee

Governance Review: Standards Regime

To be presented on Thursday, 14th January 2021

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

SUMMARY

In autumn 2019, the Policy and Resources Committee, with the support of the Court of Common Council, proposed the undertaking of a comprehensive Governance Review of the City Corporation. The Committee was conscious that some potentially contentious issues needed to be addressed and that some radical changes may need to be considered. It was, therefore, agreed that the review should be undertaken independently and Robert Rodgers, The Lord Lisvane, was appointed to conduct the Review.

Following the Review's submission, it was determined that the many proposals therein should be considered in a structured and methodical way in the coming period, with Members afforded sufficient time to read and consider the content and implications. It was noted that the recommendations were extensive and it would be for Members to consider how far they were appropriate and which should be taken forward. It was also agreed that it would be of the utmost importance to ensure that the process provided for all Members of the Court to continue to have the opportunity to input and comment on the Review.

To that end, a series of informal Member engagement sessions have been arranged to afford all Members opportunities to express their views on the various aspects of the Review as they are considered. These would then be fed back to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee to help inform its initial consideration of specific items and subsequent recommendations to the Policy and Resources Committee.

A resolution of the Court of Common Council (8 October 2020, see appendix 3) had the effect that consideration of aspects of the Review relating to the Standards Regime would need to be taken first.

Members of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee subsequently considered the various proposals relating to Section 8 of the Lisvane Review, in the context of Members' observations and reflections at various informal engagement sessions, at their meeting on 20 November 2020. Their determinations were subsequently presented to the Policy and Resources Committee for further consideration at its December 2020 meeting, and the outcomes of those deliberations are now presented to the Court for its consideration and determination, with a view to adoption for the coming municipal year. The proposals relate to the establishment of a new Standards regime and associated implications in respect of other existing arrangements.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Court of Common Council:-

1. Notes the proposals in relation to Standards made by Lord Lisvane in Section 8 of his Review (Appendix 1) and considers the recommendations of the Policy and Resources Committee thereon, as set out in paragraphs 20 - 30 of this report.
2. Authorises the Town Clerk to take such actions as are required to give effect to the decisions taken by the Court and facilitate their implementation.

MAIN REPORT

Background

1. In September 2019, the Policy and Resources Committee, proposed the undertaking of a comprehensive Governance Review of the City Corporation. The Committee was conscious that some potentially contentious issues needed to be addressed and that some radical changes may need to be considered. It was, therefore, agreed that the review should be undertaken independently and Robert Rodgers, The Lord Lisvane, was appointed to conduct the Review.
2. The Committee received Lord Lisvane's Review in September 2020 and determined that the many proposals therein should be considered in a structured and methodical way in the coming period, with Members afforded sufficient time to read and consider the content and implications. It was noted that the recommendations were far-reaching and wide-ranging and it would be for Members to consider how far they were appropriate and which should be taken forward. It was also agreed that it would be of the utmost importance to ensure that the process provided for all Members of the Court to continue to have the opportunity to input and comment on the Review.
3. The Governance Review will affect all aspects of the City Corporation's governance and all Members. Consequently, it is imperative that any implementation reflects the view of the Court, and it is likely that all Members will have views on particular elements. Their continued input remains integral and incorporating all Members' views within the next steps of the process will be vital in ensuring that the recommendations which are ultimately put to the Court are viable.
4. To that end, a series of informal Member engagement sessions were arranged to afford all Members opportunities to express their views on the various aspects of the Review as they are considered. These would then be fed back to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee to help inform its initial consideration of specific items.
5. A resolution of the Court of Common Council (8 October 2020) had the effect that consideration of aspects of the Review relating to the Standards Regime would need to be taken first. Accordingly, three engagement sessions were held and the outcomes of those sessions were considered by the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and Policy and Resources Committee in coming to their conclusions.

6. The relevant part of the Lisvane Review is Section 8, paragraphs 386 – 450, which covers proposals and reflections in relation to the Standards Regime.
7. The section provides a reflection on recent experiences in relation to the regime by way of context, together with accompanying recommendations for a proposed route forward and new system.
8. As well as the complaints and appeal procedure, the section also touches on related issues including Dispensations, Training, and Member / Officer relations.
9. Paragraphs 386 – 394 set out reflections on the statutory position and requirements in relation to Standards. Paragraphs 395 – 403 reference the recent experiences, including the Bourne Review. Both of these sub-sections are contextual and contain no specific recommendations.
10. Paragraphs 404 – 415 concern the Dispensations regime. Again, the sub-section primarily reflects on the position to date and some relevant history, with Lord Lisvane expressing his concurrence with the findings of Philip Kolvin QC.

Lisvane's recommendations

11. The next paragraphs, 416 – 437, then set out the proposed way forward, for consideration.
12. Paragraphs 416 – 420 make clear Lord Lisvane's view that Members should not sit in judgement on each other.
13. Paragraph 421 sets out a role in relation to conciliation, utilising informal mechanisms such as mediation via the Comptroller & City Solicitor or Chief Commoner, whilst noting there is a balance to be struck reputationally in a terms of a reliance on informal processes.
14. The recommendations in relation to formal process are summarised as follows:
 - The establishment of an Independent Panel composed only of independent persons, to receive allegations of misconduct, determine whether to investigate, present findings to the Court, and hear any appeal. (*Paragraph 425*).
 - The creation of a Standing Order provision to facilitate the above in such a way that the various items presented to the Court by the Panel are accepted without debate. (*Paragraph 428*).
 - The subsequent abolition of the Standards Committee and Standards Appeal Committee. (*Paragraph 435*).
15. Depending on what is ultimately decided in respect of the above, your Policy and Resources Committee was mindful that there are consequential considerations that need to be borne in mind. These include:
 - The formation / recruitment process of the new Independent Panel (*paragraphs 429 – 435 address*).

- What should happen to those areas of responsibility under the purview of Standards Committee which do not relate to complaints and so would not necessarily go to the new Panel (*Appendix 2 sets out the current Standards Committee Terms of Reference with links and commentary for ease of reference*).
16. The section also makes recommendation or commentary on a number of related areas:-
- **Register of Interests** (*paragraphs 438-439*): this relates to the way in which Members' interests are displayed on the website, which Lord Lisvane views as unhelpful / not sufficiently transparent, with a suggested change to address concerns.
 - **Training** (*paragraphs 440-442*): Lord Lisvane echoes the recommendation of Charles Bourne QC that training on standards and conduct matters should be made mandatory, and without which no Member should be eligible to be appointed to a Committee.
 - **Member / Officer Relations** (*paragraphs 443-446*): there is no specific recommendation but it is worth noting the implication that participation in the Statutory Officer Review Panel (under Standing Order 64) would fall to Independent Members of the new Panel, should such be established.
 - **Freemasonry** (*paragraphs 447-450*): whilst there is some commentary, no particular recommendation is made.

Consideration and Proposals

17. Three Member engagement sessions were held in respect of this section of the report, to inform consideration of Lisvane's recommendations. A further session with existing co-optees and independent persons serving on the Standards Committee was also held, and the summary notes of each of these discussions were presented to the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and Policy and Resources Committee. Also included within those notes were comments sent by email following the meetings.
18. Members of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee were asked at their 20 November 2020 meeting to consider the various recommendations in the context of those discussions and the views expressed by Members of the Court. Following this process, their determinations were presented to the Policy and Resources Committee, who accepted or modified proposals during discussion on 10 December 2020.
19. Having considered the various recommendations, the Policy and Resources Committee has determined its position in respect of Lord Lisvane's recommendations as follows:

Creation of an Independent Panel

20. ***Lisvane Standards Recommendation 1, paragraph 425:*** "I therefore recommend that the Corporation should set up an Independent Panel composed only of independent persons, and charge that Panel with:

- *receiving allegations of misconduct referred to it by the Monitoring Officer;*
- *deciding whether any allegation should be investigated;*
- *on the basis of the allegation, determining whether there has been a breach of the code of Conduct;*
- *reporting that determination, together with a full report of the facts, to the Court for endorsement;*
- *hearing any appeal (the appeal function will of course need to be separated rigorously from the assessment and determination function)*
- *after determination, and appeal if necessary, recommending an appropriate sanction, giving reasons as necessary.”*

The Policy and Resources Committee endorsed this proposal and noted that there were several attendant aspects that would need to be considered in the establishment of this new Panel, as indicated in Lisvane’s paragraphs 425 - 436; broadly covering the issues of process, composition, and appointment. Following its deliberations, your Committee now **recommends** as follows:-

Process

21. The Committee **recommends** the adoption of Lisvane’s recommendations in the form of a three-stage process, to be operated by the Independent Panel:
 - The first stage to be a more informal / conciliatory nature, seeking to resolve swiftly those issues which might be addressed through dispute resolution or a conversation and apology (with external dispute resolution advice to be made available to the Panel as it deems appropriate and a suitable protocol produced for such stage to be produced).
 - The second stage to then be the formal Hearing process, utilising the Independent Panel, as outlined by Lisvane (i.e. determination of investigation and breach and reporting to the Court of Common Council for endorsement).
 - The third stage to be the Appeal stage, the Panel for which should also include a minority of Members of the Court of Common Council, to help provide any relevant internal context.

The Panel should be supported by the Comptroller & City Solicitor, as the Monitoring Officer, including in respect of the production of rules and procedures as time progresses, with clerking or administrative support also provided by the Town Clerk’s department in the usual way.

Composition

22. The Committee agreed with Lisvane’s comments in relation to the need for a membership of sufficient size, to ensure that the sub-panels at the hearing and appeal stages could be comprised of entirely different Panel Members, although drawn from the same overall pool. Your Committee therefore **recommends** a panel of nine individuals, utilising staggered terms to provide for both continuity and turnover.

Recruitment and Appointment

23. With regard to Lisvane's comments at his paragraph 430 around the types of person recruited, the Committee noted a preference for the Panel to have a strong range of individuals with background in arbitration / judicial / tribunal processes, but also felt strongly that the Panel should be comprised of a diverse group of individuals and so some flexibility or pragmatism may be required to ensure this. The Committee was also supportive of remuneration (as referenced in paragraph 431), recommending the utilisation of the standard rate for public appointments, to help ensure strong candidates could be attracted and retained.

It was agreed that an open and transparent recruitment process should be employed, with the Chair of Policy & Resources, the Chief Commoner, and the Chair of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen (or their representatives) acting as an interview panel and empowered to put recommendations for appointment to the Court.

Whilst there was some discussion in relation to Lisvane's commentary at paragraph 431 as to whether existing co-optees under the current Standards Regime should be utilised as Members of the new Independent Panel (particularly given the very recent appointment of some), on balance it was felt that the Panel should be appointed entirely afresh but that, as with any open process, those currently serving would be welcome to apply in the normal fashion.

Consequently, it is **recommended** that the method of recruitment as outlined above be endorsed, with the Town Clerk authorised to advertise and undertake a recruitment process in consultation with the Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee, the Chief Commoner, and the Chair of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen (or their nominated representatives), and to put recommendations concerning appointments to the Court for consideration.

Debate at Court of Common Council

24. ***Lisvane Standards Recommendation 2, paragraph 428:*** *"I therefore recommend a Standing Order provision which would require the Panel's:*

- *determination that a breach had occurred; and*
- *recommended sanction*

to be decided without debate (and a further provision which would make it difficult or impossible for such a Standing Order to be dispensed with)."

With respect to this recommendation, the Policy and Resources Committee was agreed that it was both inappropriate and ineffective for such issues to be debated in full at the Court of Common Council. However, given the Court's ultimate sovereignty and the possibilities of suspending any Standing Order designed to prevent such debate, it was felt that such a step would be impractical in reality, notwithstanding views as to desirability. Ultimately, it was felt that the proposed new three-stage process, with Member involvement at the appeal stage, would ensure that allegations were dealt with properly and efficiently from the outset, thereby granting confidence in the process and mitigating against the risk of debate at Court.

The Committee, therefore, **recommends** that no such Standing Order be created and that Lisvane's recommendation at paragraph 428 be rejected.

Abolition of the Standards and Standards Appeals Committees

25. ***Lisvane Standards Recommendation 3, paragraph 435:*** *"Until the Independent Panel has been recruited and is ready to begin its work, the present arrangements should remain in place. Thereafter, the Standards Committee should be abolished, and with it the Standards Appeals Committee."*

The Policy and Resources Committee, noting the strength of feeling amongst Members, agreed with this proposal and considered the practicalities associated with ensuring this was achieved in an orderly fashion; specifically, timescales and interim responsibility for those areas overseen by the Standards Committee which did not form part of the complaints process, such as dispensations.

Timescale

26. The Committee **recommends** that the process of abolition begin immediately such that it is completed by the end of the current municipal year, with a view to the new arrangements being in place for the 2021/22 municipal year.

Interim responsibilities

27. Given that the intended abolition would be prior to the establishment of a new overall committee framework, the Committee considered the various areas of responsibility currently overseen by the Standards Committee. The Terms of Reference of the Committee are set out appendix 2, with links and commentary, for ease of reference.

In view of the ongoing review of the overall committee structure, the Policy and Resources Committee is of the view that that, with the exception of the area of dispensations, the Members Privileges Sub-Committee of the Policy and Resources Committee, chaired by the Chief Commoner, should be **recommended** to take on these functions on an interim basis.

Dispensations

28. Whilst distinct from the complaints process, the Committee reflected on the recent experiences concerning dispensations and the significant benefits of applications being determined independently. Consequently, it was agreed that responsibility for considering dispensations should also be granted to the new Independent Panel and **recommends** accordingly.

The Committee noted, however, that responsibility for decision-making must legally remain with the Court of Common Council, or one of its committees, sub-committees, officers, or another local authority or joint committee; therefore, the Independent Panel could only make recommendations as to whether or not dispensations should be granted or refused. Your Committee **recommends**, therefore, that authority be vested in the Town Clerk, on behalf of the Court of Common Council, to make determinations regarding applications for

dispensations upon the recommendation of the Independent Panel (i.e. exercising a ratification function).

Further, it was observed that an urgent decision in respect of an application may be required from time-to-time, the timescales such that it was not possible for the Independent Panel to consider the application. To that end, it is **recommended** that the Comptroller and City Solicitor also be authorised to make determinations as to urgent applications, should they arise.

Register of Interests

29. ***Lisvane Standards Recommendation 3, paragraph 438:*** “At the moment, the registrable interests of an individual Member may be seen by going to that Member’s page on the website. So far as the Corporation as a whole is concerned, I do not think that provides adequate transparency. The whole of the Register of Interests should be available on dedicated pages on the website. This will, for example, allow easy visibility of whether an interest relevant to a particular function of the Corporation is shared by a number of Members.”

The Committee was supportive of the proposal to change the way in which the Register of Interests is displayed and the associated increase in transparency. It therefore **recommends** that this proposal be implemented as soon as is practicable.

Training

30. ***Lisvane Standards Recommendation 4, paragraph 441:*** “Training on standards and conduct matters should be mandatory, and without which no Member should be appointed to a Committee.”

Cognisant of the range of views on this matter, your Committee felt that the majority view was that, whilst training should be mandatory in some areas, this should not be across the board and should instead only be in respect of those specific committees with a statutory or quasi-judicial function. With reference to training around standards and conduct, it was suggested that such training should be made available for all Members immediately after each election. In all cases, training should be made available and be purposeful and up-to-date, with refresher sessions available to allow for continuous learning or development.

In the event of non-compliance in respect of those areas where training should be mandatory, it was felt that any sanction should be automatic and relate to the specific committee, i.e. consistent with the current approach in respect of the Licensing Committee, whereby any Member unwilling to undertake the relevant training was not permitted to serve on the hearing sub-committees.

Conclusion

31. Various proposals have been made by Lord Lisvane in relation to Standards, in Section 8 of his Review.
32. Members of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee and Policy and Resources Committee have considered his proposals and the attendant implications of any decisions, paying mind to the views of all Members made through the informal

engagement process. The Court of Common Council is now asked to consider those proposals and, subject to its determination, grant the necessary approvals to facilitate the implementation of new arrangements in time for the 2021.22 municipal year.

Appendices:

- **Appendix 1:** Extract – Lord Lisvane’s Governance Review, Section 8, Standards
- **Appendix 2:** Standards Committee Terms of Reference (with comments on responsibilities)
- **Appendix 3:** Resolution from Court of Common Council, 8 October 2020

This page is intentionally left blank

8

Standards and Conduct

The statutory requirement

386. The Localism Act 2011 replaced the conduct regime of the Local Government Act 2000 with rather less prescriptive requirements, and no effective sanctions (except in the case of non-registration of interests⁸⁷). The Corporation is subject to the 2011 Act's requirements in respect of standards and conduct, in its capacity as a local authority and also as a police authority. It has chosen to apply its standards and conduct arrangements to all its functions, even if these are not of a local authority type.

387. The 2011 Act provides that “a relevant authority [which the Corporation is] must promote and maintain high standards of conduct by members and co-opted members of the authority”.⁸⁸

388. The Act requires the adoption of “a code dealing with the conduct that is expected of members and co-opted members of the authority when they are operating in that capacity”.⁸⁹ Such a code must be consistent with the Nolan principles of selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership.

389. Under the 2000 Act, authorities had to have standards committees chaired by an independent person. Under the 2011, all that is necessary is that there should be “arrangements”:

“arrangements under which allegations can be investigated; and

“arrangements under which decisions on allegations can be made.”⁹⁰

390. The arrangements must also include the appointment of “at least one independent person

⁸⁷ Section 34 introduced a new criminal offence of failing to declare or register a pecuniary interest.

⁸⁸ Section 27(1).

⁸⁹ Section 27(2).

⁹⁰ Section 28(6).

“whose views are to be sought, and taken into account, by the authority before it makes its decision on an allegation that it has decided to investigate.”⁹¹

391. The Corporation decided to discharge the duty to have “arrangements” by setting up a Standards Committee. This consists of two Aldermen, ten Common Councillors and five (previously four) co-opted (external and independent) members.

392. The Committee has the task of promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct; maintaining the Code of Conduct and the Protocol on Member/Officer Relations, and associated guidance; advising and training Members and co-opted Members on conduct matters; monitoring allegations referred to it, and assessing and hearing such allegations; deciding on whether allegations should be investigated; deciding on whether a breach has occurred; and determining an appropriate sanction.

393. There is nothing out of the way about these functions; they are similar to those in the arrangements made by many authorities, and they are broadly similar to those under the previous statutory regime.

394. I will not rehearse the detailed provisions and processes; they are dealt with thoroughly and very well in the Independent Review by Charles Bourne QC,⁹² who also makes observations on how they might be improved, and I return to some of these below.

The experience of the Standards Committee and the conduct regime

395. I must first acknowledge the efforts made by all those who have tried to make the standards regime work as intended. They have done so in good faith, and are not to be blamed for the present situation.

396. However, the Corporation has now got to the point where I do not think that it is sensible or practical to try to repair the current arrangements, nor to try and reconstitute the Standards Committee along new lines.

⁹¹ Section 28(7).

⁹² *An Independent Review by Leading Counsel of the Arrangements made under the Localism Act 2011 by the City of London Corporation for Addressing Matters Connected with the Conduct of Members and Co-opted Members*, December 2016.

397. The problems appear to have started in 2015 with the first complaint against a Member to reach the investigation stage. The Member was found, both at the initial hearing and on appeal, to have breached the Code of Conduct. Information about this complaint in the Standards Committee's Annual Report of 23 June 2016 included the name of the Member concerned, and on that account provoked widespread criticism of the process.
398. From there things seem to have gone downhill, with the Standards Committee and its members being subjected to frequent criticism, sometimes expressed in unacceptably discourteous terms. The Standards Committee commissioned the independent review from Charles Bourne QC to which I have referred. Following that review, the Court established a Standards Regime Review Working Party, separately from the Standards Committee.
399. That Working Party, and subsequent consideration by the Court, rejected the Bourne Report's recommendation that undertaking training in standards and conduct matters should be a prerequisite for being appointed to any Corporation Committee. It also ignored Mr Bourne's warning about splitting decision-making on appeals, providing that the new Appeal Panel, independent of the Standards Committee, should be able to substitute a new decision on appeal (on the papers only) rather than refer the case back to the Standards Committee for reconsideration.
400. However, the Bourne Report led to the establishment of new complaints procedures, and a revised Code of Conduct and guidance from March 2018. A Standards Appeals Committee was also established.
401. Unfortunately the new procedures did not receive practical backing from the Court. A complaint was made against a Member; after hearing and appeal he was found to have breached the Code of Conduct, and the Standards Committee recommended that he be suspended for twelve months from the Standards Appeals Committee, of which he was a member.
402. However, when in March 2020 the matter was reported to the Court of Common Council for endorsement, the Court declined to do so. The debate illustrated the weakness of the Corporation's approach to matters of Member conduct. In the debate the appropriateness – or otherwise – of the whole process was revisited; arrangements

previously approved by the Court were criticised; and the case was rehearsed without adequate evidence.⁹³

403. The handling of Standards matters has involved significant cost. At one time or another, four Silks have been involved, together with external investigators. To date the total cost, including the internal costs of running the Ethical Framework, is more than £500,000, which is wholly disproportionate.

Dispensations

404. The standards mix has been made more toxic by a long-running dispute over the granting of dispensations.
405. The Localism Act 2011 replaced the 2000 Act's provisions relating to personal and prejudicial interests with a scheme for "disclosable pecuniary interests" (DPIs).
406. Interests which may give rise to a DPI are listed in the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012⁹⁴. They fall into the following categories: employment, office, trade or profession; sponsorship (of the Member concerned by a third party) a current contract for goods or services; beneficial interest in land in the authority's area; licence to occupy land in the authority's area; tenancy with beneficial interest; and beneficial interest in securities of a body based in the authority's area. A Member's spouse, civil partner or co-habitor with such an interest is within the registration and declaration requirements.
407. The default setting, under section 31(4) of the Localism Act 2011, is that a Member with a DPI which is engaged (in other words, upon the precise item of business before the Court or a Committee) should neither speak nor vote.
408. However, it is possible for the authority concerned, on written application, to grant a "dispensation", on the terms specified in section 33 of the 2011 Act, but subject to conditions which are explicit in that section, and which amount to the following (two conditions, relating to political groups and executive arrangements, do not apply to the Corporation's circumstances):

⁹³ Minutes of the Court of Common Council, 5th March 2020, Minute 24.

⁹⁴ S.I., 2012. No. 1464.

- without the dispensation the number of Members affected would make up so great a proportion of the whole that the transaction of business would be impeded;
- that the dispensation would be in the interests of persons living in the authority's area; and
- (a catch-all) "that it is otherwise appropriate to grant a dispensation".

Section 33 says that a dispensation may not be given for a period longer than four years. A dispensation may be in respect of speaking or voting, or both.

409. The issue at the centre of contention was whether the Corporation could give "blanket" or "open-ended" dispensations up to, or preferably for the whole of, the maximum of four years allowed by the Act. In December 2019 the City Solicitor took advice from Leading Counsel (Philip Kolvin QC) as to the lawfulness of open-ended dispensations.

410. In his Opinion Mr Kolvin advised that such dispensations would be unlawful. The two principal grounds of his advice were, first, that they would be too wide, taking in everything relevant to a DPI except (in the terms of the applications at issue) something which affected the Member concerned in a unique way; and second, that the authority could grant a dispensation only "having had regard to all relevant circumstances". It would not be possible to grant a blanket dispensation of up to four years because there was no way of predicting those circumstances.

411. Mr Kolvin identified five other difficulties with the open-ended approach, but also offered a possible compromise policy. I respectfully agree with Mr Kolvin. I do not believe that by any stretch of statutory construction he could have come to any other conclusion.

412. The events which followed were no more edifying than those which preceded Mr Kolvin's advice. It was alleged that the City Solicitor had given partial Instructions to Counsel, and that this had resulted in partial and incorrect advice. This resulted in a tart rejoinder from Mr Kolvin in his Supplementary Advice. On 24th

January 2020, after a somewhat confused debate, the Standards Committee voted to accept Mr Kolvin's substantive Opinion.

413. On 18th June 2020 the Court of Common Council considered the standards regime on the basis of a Motion moved by Marianne Fredericks "to address the longstanding concerns of Members in relation to the current Standards Regime". Following the approval of an amendment to the Motion, the Court resolved: "That this Honourable Court resolves that the Motion to convene a Working Party chaired by the Chief Commoner to report to the Court as soon as practicable on how proceedings for breaches of the Code of Conduct may be conducted be referred to Lord Lisvane for full and comprehensive incorporation into the Governance Review."⁹⁵

414. I trust that this Part of my Report demonstrates that I have taken the view of the Court expressed through this Resolution fully into account.

Where does the Corporation stand now?

415. I think that there would be widespread agreement that on conduct matters the events of the last five years have been regrettable. They have also been potentially damaging to the Corporation's reputation. An authority of the stature of the City of London Corporation, seeking to present itself as a champion of the highest standards, simply cannot afford to continue in this way.

The way forward: principles

416. Above all, the Corporation must set itself to maintain and support the promotion of those highest standards, and its Members need to be fully engaged in this endeavour.

417. Experience so far shows that Members cannot (and, in my view, should not) pass judgement upon their colleagues.⁹⁶ I note that, in the consideration of the Motion on 18th June, the words "without Members sitting in judgement on each other" were removed, on the basis that "a jury of peers could well offer the best protection to Member complaints being dealt with fairly, notwithstanding the challenges for Members involved".⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Minutes of the Court of Common Council, 18th June 2020, Minute 11.

⁹⁶ I cannot resist a quotation from Sellers and Yeatman, *1066 And All That*, speaking of the provisions of *Magna Carta* (no doubt Clause 21): "No baron should be tried, except by a special jury of other barons who would understand". For the avoidance of doubt, I think that it was intended to be satirical.

⁹⁷ Minutes of the Court of Common Council, 18th June 2020, Minute 11.

418. It will be clear from this Report that I strongly disagree with that view; and I judge that, increasingly, it does not have public credibility.
419. A fair but exacting process must be available to deal with complaints against Members, whether those come from other Members, Officers, or members of the public.
420. Consistent with the principles of natural justice, decision-making processes should be as open and transparent as possible, not least so that constituents can be properly informed when holding Members to account.
421. As the Bourne Report pointed out⁹⁸, there is a role for conciliation, drawing upon the skills both of the Monitoring Officer and the Chief Commoner, and no doubt others. But I echo Charles Bourne's caution against relying too much upon informal resolution. If a complaint is *prima facie* sufficiently serious, then informal resolution may not be appropriate and indeed may be reputationally hazardous.

The way forward: practicalities

422. It is clear that the Standards Committee approach has failed and that it cannot realistically be revived.
423. Although I have been told that the "outsourcing" of the Standards process is not possible, I disagree. The 2011 Act no longer requires that a relevant authority should have a Standards Committee, merely that "arrangements" should be in place. Those arrangements must include the appointment of *at least* [my italics] one independent person.⁹⁹
424. It is therefore the case that an authority may decide to have arrangements which are almost entirely in the hands of independent persons.
425. **I therefore recommend that the Corporation should set up an Independent Panel composed only of independent persons, and charge that Panel with:**

⁹⁸ Paragraph 98.

⁹⁹ Section 28(7).

- receiving allegations of misconduct referred to it by the Monitoring Officer;
- deciding whether any allegation should be investigated;
- on the basis of the allegation, determining whether there has been a breach of the code of Conduct;
- reporting that determination, together with a full report of the facts, to the Court for endorsement;¹⁰⁰
- hearing any appeal (the appeal function will of course need to be separated rigorously from the assessment and determination function)
- after determination, and appeal if necessary, recommending an appropriate sanction, giving reasons as necessary.

426. The Localism Act 2011 places on the authority the responsibility deciding whether there has been a breach of the Code of Conduct, and of taking action following a finding of a breach.¹⁰¹ These are therefore not functions which may be delegated to a Panel of the sort that I have recommended.

427. But it will be essential to avoid the replaying of a case in the way that occurred in March 2020. This would be especially so if the upheld complaint were to be from an Officer (who would not have the opportunity of defence in a debate) against a Member (who would).

428. **I therefore recommend a Standing Order provision which would require the Panel's**

- **determination that a breach had occurred; and**
- **recommended sanction**

¹⁰⁰ Under Section 28(11) of the Localism Act 2011.

¹⁰¹ Section 28(11).

to be decided without debate (and a further provision which would make it difficult or impossible for such a Standing Order to be dispensed with).

429. The Panel should review the current Codes of Conduct and guidance, in consultation with the Governance and Nominations Committee, and develop its own Rules of Procedure, for communication to (but not for approval by) the Court of Common Council.
430. The Independent Members¹⁰² of the Panel should be recruited in the same way as the co-opted members of the Standards Committee have been. Judicial or other legal experience should not be a necessary qualification, but independence, authority, judgement, skill in analysing and assessing evidence, and experience at a fairly high level in the public or private sectors, will be required.
431. I think that it may be necessary to have about eight Members of the Panel, to provide Members to constitute Hearing Panels and Appeal Panels, and to provide a degree of collegiate approach and mutual support. Members of the Panel should be paid an appropriate daily rate. It will be for the Corporation to decide whether the present co-opted members of the Standards Committee should, if they are willing, become Independent Members of the Panel, or whether there should be a clean break and a new recruitment from scratch.
432. The terms of appointment will need to be staggered to avoid the need for substantial replacement of the Panel, and loss of embodied experience, at any one time. A base term of appointment might be four years, with reappointment for one further term.
433. I do not offer a draft Standing Order at this stage, but will provide one if the Corporation wishes it.
434. Indemnity and insurance will be required, as agreed by the Court for the current co-opted Members.¹⁰³
435. Until the Independent Panel has been recruited and is ready to begin its work, the present arrangements should remain in place.

¹⁰² The Localism Act uses the term “independent person”. In the context of the Panel I have used the term “Independent Member”. Section 28(8)(c) of the Localism Act makes provision for the method of appointment.

¹⁰³ See Minutes of the Court of Common Council, 5th December 2019.

Thereafter, the Standards Committee should be abolished, and with it the Standards Appeals Committee.

436. **I realise that these new arrangements may be unwelcome or uncomfortable for some, but I would observe that the Corporation had the opportunity to get this right, and failed to do so.**

437. If my recommendation for the abolition of the Barbican Residential Committee is accepted, I suspect that the cause of at least some of the difficulties experienced over the last few years will be removed.¹⁰⁴ It may also be that the restrictions imposed by section 618 of the Housing Act 1985¹⁰⁵ will for the same reason become less irksome.

Other issues

The Register of Interests

438. At the moment, the registrable interests of an individual Member may be seen by going to that Member's page on the website. So far as the Corporation as a whole is concerned, I do not think that provides adequate transparency. **The whole of the Register of Interests should be available on dedicated pages on the website.** This will, for example, allow easy visibility of whether an interest relevant to a particular function of the Corporation is shared by a number of Members.

439. The current practice also appears to be in contravention of section 29 of the Localism Act 2011, which requires that the authority's register "is published on the authority's website". I take this to mean that the register is accessible in its entirety, not that excerpts from it are attached to individual pages.

Training on standards and conduct matters

440. The Bourne Report said that "In my view the City's Code, or its arrangements in general, would be materially improved by requiring Members to attend such training on conduct and standards matters as the City may provide from time to time...It would be

¹⁰⁴ See also SO 44.

¹⁰⁵ "...no person shall vote as a member of that [Common] Council, or any such committee [charged with any purpose of the 1985 Act or the Housing Associations Act 1985] on a resolution or question which is proposed or arises in pursuance of this Act or the Housing Associations Act 1985 and relates to land in which he is beneficially interested" (s618(3)).

appropriate to require attendance as a condition for serving on committees”.¹⁰⁶

441. This recommendation was unfortunately not accepted, and I repeat it now. **Training on standards and conduct matters should be mandatory, and without which no Member should be appointed to a Committee.** Charles Bourne QC observed “standards in public office and attitudes to equality and diversity do not stand still but instead continuously evolve, and those elected to public office should be leaders rather than followers in this process”.¹⁰⁷ **I agree.**

442. Apart from being a sensible precaution to protect the Corporation from criticism, I doubt whether in the absence of such a requirement the Corporation could meet – certainly the spirit, but possibly also in full the formal provision – of section 27(1) of the Localism Act 2011, which requires a relevant authority to promote and maintain high standards of conduct. To reject mandatory training would seem to fall short of the requirement to promote high standards of conduct.

Member/Officer relations

443. The Corporation has a Protocol on Member/Officer Relations, which forms part of the Code of Corporate Governance. This needs to be read in parallel with the Code of Conduct applying to Members.

444. It is essential that Officers at any level are able to raise matters relating to the conduct of other Officers (for which there are separate provisions) or to the conduct of Members towards them. And it should be borne in mind that this is a relationship which is not under the sole control of the Corporation. A serious case may end up in an Employment Tribunal, with all the reputational risks involved.

445. It should not need saying that a mutually respectful relationship between Members and Officers is essential to the Corporation’s success and reputation, and to the retention of the staff who are an asset to the institution.

446. I note that SO 64 (6) (Disciplinary Action) envisages the involvement of Independent Members of the Standards Committee

¹⁰⁶ Bourne Report, paragraph 52.

¹⁰⁷ *ibid.*

on a Statutory Officer Review Panel. This is a statutorily required¹⁰⁸ role which will fall to Independent Members of the Panel recommended above.

Freemasonry

447. I mention this issue because it has been raised with me a number of times during my Review, both in the context of diversity “there are more Freemasons on the Court than there are women” and in respect of what individuals have seen as “below the radar” collective influences upon Committee appointments, the allocation of Chairs, and other decisions.
448. Freemasonry is a society which has more than 300,000 members, all men, in England and Wales, including some 40,000 in London. Its three key principles are Neighbourly Concern, Charity and Moral Standards (referred to by Masons as Brotherly Love, Relief and Truth). It is a charitable donor on a very large scale all over the country, including support of projects within the Square Mile.
449. I should put beyond any doubt that I make no comment on Freemasonry or its role but, given the views put to me, I think it helpful to comment upon issues of transparency. The recommendations that I make on recorded votes, and on the availability of a full Register of Interests as a single document on the website, will contribute to that transparency.
450. So far as the use of Guildhall facilities (also raised with me) is concerned, I take it that Masonic gatherings are on the same basis, and charged on the same basis, as any other gathering of Members for a purpose not directly connected with Corporation business.

¹⁰⁸ See The Local Authorities (Standing Orders)(England)(Amendment) Regulations 2015 (S.I., 2015, No. 881), Schedule, paragraph 4.

STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Below, against the Standards Committee's **Terms of Reference**, is some commentary to highlight its various roles and responsibilities, where necessary, so it is clear where thought as to the reallocation of responsibilities may be required:

To be responsible for:-

- (a) promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct by Members and Co-opted Members of the City of London Corporation and to assist Members and Co-opted Members to observe the City of London Corporation's Code of Conduct;
- (b) preparing, keeping under review and monitoring the City of London Corporation's Member Code of Conduct and making recommendations to the Court of Common Council in respect of the adoption or revision, as appropriate, of such Code of Conduct – **the current Code was last approved by the Court on 16 July 2020. That version can be found [HERE](#). There is no cross-reference within the Code itself to the Complaints procedure. Lisvane recommends a role for the Governance & Nominations Committee.**
- (c) keeping under review, monitoring and revising as appropriate the City of London Corporation's Guidance to Members on the Code of Conduct and the complaints procedure and relevant paperwork, reporting any changes on these documents to the Court of Common Council in the Committee's annual report. – **last approved by the Court on 8 March 2018. The document can be found [HERE](#). Again, no explicit reference to the Complaints Procedure here, although it does reference the Officer/Member Protocol – para 37 onwards.**
- (d) keeping under review by way of an annual update by the Director of HR, the City of London Corporation's Employee Code of Conduct and, in relation to any revisions, making recommendations to the Establishment Committee – **essentially this is an annual report from HR to the Standards Committee and any issues they have are ultimately passed to Establishment for consideration and approval if they see fit.**
- (e) keeping under review and monitoring the Protocol on Member/Officer Relations and, in relation to any revisions, making recommendations to the Establishment Committee- **again, this is an annual report from HR to the Standards Committee and any issues they have are ultimately passed to Establishment for consideration and approval if they see fit.**
- (f) advising and training Members and Co-opted Members on matters relating to the City of London Corporation's Code of Conduct – **this is provided by the Comptroller & City Solicitor as Monitoring Officer. He undertakes training open to all Members periodically and training is also offered to all as part of the induction programmes we run after all out elections. Members of the**

Standards Committee receive more in-depth training around the handling of Complaints, etc.

- (g) monitoring all allegations referred to it and dealing with assessment of and any hearing into any allegations of breach of the City of London Corporation's Code of Conduct in respect of Members and Co-opted Members, and in particular – **this is governed by the Complaints Procedure which has been in force since 19 July 2018 and can be found [HERE](#) .**
- (i) to determine whether any allegation should be investigated by or on behalf of the Town Clerk or the Monitoring Officer and their findings reported to the Committee – **this is currently done via an Assessment Sub-Committee which is drawn from the membership of the Standards Committee as and when required.**
 - (ii) in relation to any allegation that it has decided to investigate, to determine whether there has been a breach of the Code of Conduct, taking into account the views of an Independent Person appointed under the Localism Act 2011 – **this is currently done via a Hearing Sub-Committee which is also drawn from the membership of the Standards Committee.**
 - (iii) where there has been a breach of the Code of Conduct, to determine the appropriate sanction, and where this involves removal of a Member or Co-opted Member from any committee or sub-committee, to make an appropriate recommendation to the relevant appointing body – **this is also the job of the Hearing Sub-Committee at present.**
- (h) dealing with/determining applications for Dispensation – **this process is currently managed via a Dispensations Sub-Committee; however, the authority to decide applications for certain types of straightforward dispensations has been delegated to the Town Clerk – the Dispensations Policy/Guidance can be found [HERE](#) and has been in operation since January 2020. Mention of Section 618 and the limitations this poses can be found at paras 20 and 21.**
- (i) To prepare an annual report on its activity for submission to the Court of Common Council.

**Resolution of the Court of Common Council relating to Standards /
Governance Review
8 October 2020**

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.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – Planning and Transportation Committee

City Plan 2036: Revisions to Proposed Submission Draft Plan

To be presented on Thursday, 14th January 2021

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

SUMMARY

The draft Local Plan, titled City Plan 2036, was agreed for Regulation 19 pre-submission consultation by the Court of Common Council at its meeting on 21 May 2020. Local Plan regulations at that time prevented consultation taking place without making physical copies of the Plan available for inspection. Amendments to the Regulations in July 2020 have now enabled a website only consultation.

Further changes to the Plan are now required prior to the consultation taking place to address revisions to permitted development rights and the Use Classes Order, which came into effect on 31 August and 1 September 2020; to acknowledge the short term impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, whilst emphasising that the medium to longer term fundamentals underpinning the City's economic success remain in place; to update the Plan to reflect the City's climate ambitions in the newly adopted Climate Action Strategy; and to make minor factual updates.

The further changes were agreed by your Planning & Transportation Committee on 17 November 2020 and by your Policy & Resources Committee on 10 December 2020 and these are now recommended to the Court of Common Council. The full schedule of further proposed changes is attached as Appendix 1.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Members are recommended to:

1. Agree the proposed changes to the Proposed Submission draft Local Plan set out in Appendix 1 and that the draft Local Plan be published for consultation.
2. Authorise the Director of the Built Environment to make further non-material amendments and editorial changes prior to public consultation.
3. Agree that, following consultation, the Local Plan, the public representations and other supporting documentation be submitted to the Secretary of State, for Examination.
4. Agree that, if any material changes are required to the Local Plan following consultation and prior to submission, consideration of these changes should be delegated to the Planning and Transportation Committee.
5. Authorise the Director of the Built Environment, in liaison with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning & Transportation Committee, to compile a list of

any proposed non-material changes to the Local Plan in response to public representations and submit this to the Secretary of State.

MAIN REPORT

Background

1. The Proposed Submission City Plan 2036 was considered by the Planning and Transportation Committee at an informal, virtual, meeting on 31st March 2020. The Plan was then approved for pre-submission consultation by the Policy and Resources Committee on 7th May 2020 and subsequently by this Honourable Court on 21st May 2020. Formal pre-submission consultation was delayed due to Covid-19 restrictions which prevented the Corporation making the Plan and supporting documents available for physical inspection in the City. However, amendments to the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations in July 2020 have now temporarily removed the requirement for copies of the Plan to be available for physical inspection.

The need for further Plan refinement

2. In late July 2020, the Government laid a series of new regulations before Parliament, making changes to permitted development rights and to the 1987 Use Classes Order. These changes came into effect on 31st August 2020 and 1st September 2020. To ensure that the Local Plan is sound and reflects these changes to national planning policy, further refinements to the draft document are now proposed. It is also proposed that adjustments are made to address some of the short term economic, social and health and wellbeing impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, to update references in the Plan to the City Corporation's Climate Action Strategy which has now been adopted, and to make other factual updates.

Use Classes Order

3. A revised Use Classes Order came into effect on 1st September 2020. A report detailing the changes to the Use Classes Order and permitted development rights, and the implications for the City of London, was considered by the Planning and Transportation Committee on 8th September 2020. The most significant change is the creation of a new Commercial, Business and Service Uses class, Class E, which replaces the B1 business use class and the A1, A2 and A3 retail use classes. A change of use within the E class is not considered development and is not, therefore, subject to planning control.
4. The Proposed Submission draft Local Plan was prepared on the basis of the previous 1987 Use Classes Order and has a number of policies which specifically reference the Use Classes Order, seeking to manage how sites and buildings change over time. The key policy areas where change is required are:
 - a. **Protection of office accommodation.** The proposed amendments reflect the potential for change within the E Use Class, whilst continuing to emphasise the continuing need to promote and retain a critical mass of office accommodation in the City. Emerging Local Plan policy already allows for greater flexibility for other commercial uses at basement and ground floor

level in line with the ambitions of the new Use Classes Order and substantive change to the policy approach is not considered necessary.

- b. **Retail provision.** The Proposed Submission draft Local Plan seeks to concentrate A1 retail shops within the Principal Shopping Centres (PSCs), with retail also encouraged within the Retail Links. Isolated A1 retail units are protected. The E Use Class is intended to provide greater flexibility to allow changes of use within town centres to retain their vitality and viability, and removes the ability to manage the change between most retail uses and between retail, office and some other commercial uses. Amendments are suggested to the Local Plan's retail policies which address these changes while continuing to promote the role of the City's PSCs as centres for traditional shops, providing comparison and convenience retail. Most City developers, landowners and occupiers are expected to continue to see the benefits of providing active frontages and the additional vibrancy and income that comes from a mix of ground floor uses, so significant change is not expected, particularly within the PSCs.

Covid-19 Impacts

5. The Proposed Submission draft Local Plan was prepared prior to the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, which has had significant health, well-being, environmental and economic impacts both locally and globally. Although these impacts are expected to be relatively short term, the pandemic is leading to behavioural changes. Some of these changes are temporary, but some are likely to become established as part of the 'new normal'. The acceleration of existing trends and the creation of new trends both need to be taken into account in the emerging Local Plan, which is planning not just for the next few years but for the medium and longer term over a 15-year period. Therefore, the Plan needs to look beyond the current pandemic to a period when the City is once more a vibrant base for a wide range of existing and new businesses, operating more flexibly to meet the changing business environment, space needs and lifestyle expectations of their workforce.
6. The immediate impact of Covid-19 has been to shift much of the City's business online with many City workers working remotely, and consequent significant reductions in journeys into the City and footfall within it. Although the pace and scale of future growth in the City of London is uncertain in the short term, the longer term geographical, economic and social fundamentals underpinning the success of the City as a vibrant centre of business creativity and innovation remain in place. Strong interest in pre-application planning advice and investment suggest continued confidence in the City as a place in which to do business. The ways that people live, work, travel and use city centres will, in the future, be different, but the City will continue to be an attractive and sustainable meeting place where people and businesses come together for creative innovation.
7. Contextual changes and a reiteration of the Local Plan's flexible and adaptable strategy are considered appropriate at this stage. The strategy already seeks to facilitate a healthy and inclusive City, new ways of working, improvements in the

public realm, urban greening and a radical transformation of the City's streets. Given the particular impacts of the pandemic on the retail and hospitality sector, Colliers International have been commissioned to provide a supplementary commentary to the 2017 Retail Needs Assessment to take account of current circumstances and to provide a robust basis for the retail policies in the version of the Plan that will be submitted for examination.

8. As the Local Plan progresses to consultation and examination, the evidence base will be refreshed as part of the regular annual development monitoring programme. Further evidence will also be commissioned, where necessary. If this evidence suggests a need for wider review, this can be considered through a future review of the Plan.

Development Pipeline

9. The Plan's employment growth projections and the related office space growth target pre-date Covid and its health, behavioural and economic effects. Employment growth may be slower in the short to medium term than previously projected due to economic disruption and behavioural changes such as more remote and occasional working. However, lower levels of employment growth do not translate directly into lower demand and need for office floorspace overall. Covid restrictions have significantly reduced current office occupancy capacity and, as we come out of the pandemic, it is likely there will be a renewed emphasis on providing more social and collaborative space in buildings, with lower office occupation densities overall. In the short to medium term, reductions in employees commuting daily into the City may be offset by this trend for lower occupation density and more social space. Some firms may reduce their total space requirements but that may provide opportunities for other firms who previously did not have much presence in the City to take up the newly available space in what is an excellent, accessible business location. The net result of these emerging trends will be monitored carefully to ensure that the Plan policy implementation remains appropriate to the evolving picture.
10. The Proposed Submission draft Local Plan provides for an uplift in office floorspace of 2 million square metres over the period 2016 to 2036. As at March 2020, there had already been a net gain in office stock of 0.58 million square metres (29% of the target) with a further 0.76 million square metres (38% of target) under construction, meaning that approximately two thirds of the target is likely to be completed in the near future. The overall office floorspace target is therefore considered to be achievable and is consistent with our wider aspirations for the City as a commercial centre of innovation and creativity

London Recharged Report

11. The London Recharged Report, produced by the City Corporation in partnership with Oliver Wyman and Arup, was published on 20th October 2020: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/supporting-businesses/economic-research/research-publications/london-recharged>. The report makes recommendations for the ways that businesses operate in London, the role of local and central government and the need to deliver a more diverse and representative workforce that makes the best use of London's talents. Amongst the key recommendations are a number

that specifically relate to the work of the Planning and Transportation Committee and the City's Local Plan, including:

- Create spaces to innovate, akin to start-up incubators. The incubators should provide workspaces with experts from government, academia and business to coalesce and innovate on specific priority themes.
- Pilot transformation of London's office stock to support new uses, including the development of 'hyper flexible spaces'.
- Motivate SMEs and artists to re-enter the city centre by providing 'hives' of affordable workspace and access to basic infrastructure.
- Explore ways to innovate London's transport network considering new consumer/ commuter behaviours and the network's financial difficulties. Options could include the creation of 'flexible working' season tickets.

12. The Local Plan aligns closely with a number of these recommendations and officers participated in the steering groups informing its production. For instance, the Local Plan does:

- Encourage flexible and adaptable workspaces, including the need for incubator space and space for innovation and start-ups.
- Encourage active and vibrant uses at ground floor, to animate City spaces and provide an environment which is attractive to investors and workers.
- Highlight the importance of culture and cultural enterprises in the City's attractiveness, including a new requirement for major developments to provide cultural plans and to consider the provision of creative spaces.
- Place greater emphasis on transport within and to the City of London, increasing opportunities for active travel and emphasising the importance of the City as a sustainable business hub.

13. It is significant that the London Recharged Report has been prepared during the Covid pandemic and was informed by interviews with many senior figures to gauge their latest views on the short term and long-term implications of the pandemic for London. The close alignment between the Local Plan and the recommendations in the London Recharged Report provide some reassurance that the Plan is sufficiently flexible to still be relevant in current circumstances. Nonetheless, the schedule attached to this report includes several proposed changes to reflect key aspects of the London Recharged Report, such as the increased importance of providing spaces which encourage collaboration and creativity.

Climate Action Strategy

14. The Court of Common Council on 8th October 2020 approved a Climate Action Strategy for the City Corporation, which sets out a radical programme of measures to:

- a. Reduce carbon emissions and a trajectory towards achieving a zero carbon City Corporation and wider City of London by 2040.
 - b. Ensure the City Corporation's buildings and public realm are resilient to more extreme weather conditions and rising sea levels.
- 15. The Climate Action Strategy introduces a new way of working where the risks and opportunities arising from climate change are integrated into all City Corporation decision making. Through this strategy, the City Corporation will secure and strengthen its position as a world leading financial and professional services centre, with a public realm and buildings which are attractive places to work, live, study and visit.
- 16. The Proposed Submission draft Local Plan already addresses the need to reduce carbon emissions, increase resilience and has, at its heart, the delivery of a sustainable and green city. The delay in consulting on the Plan and the adoption of the Climate Action Strategy provide an opportunity to refine this approach, ensuring a consistent and strong message on climate is presented by the City Corporation.

Proposed Changes

- 17. Appendix 1 sets out a schedule of changes to the Proposed Submission draft Local Plan. The schedule identifies those changes that are required to respond to the Use Classes Order, Covid-19 and the Climate Action Strategy. The proposed changes also take account of advice received from a Planning Inspector who held a virtual advisory visit with officers in July, albeit his advice is not binding on the Inspector who will subsequently carry out the independent examination of the City's Local Plan. A copy of the Local Plan as approved at Court in May will be sent to Members electronically before the meeting so that the proposed changes can be compared to the previously approved Plan.
- 18. The schedule of changes set out at Appendix 1 has been considered and approved by the Planning and Transportation Committee on 17th November 2020 and by the Policy and Resources Committee on 10th December 2021. Since the amendments are material changes to the Plan that was previously agreed by the Court, they also require the express approval of the Court of Common Council.
- 19. The schedule also identifies a number of factual updates to the Proposed Submission draft Plan. Most of these changes are non-material and, in line with the authorisation previously given, do not need express approval, but are included here for completeness.

Next Steps

- 20. If agreed by Court, the Proposed Submission draft Plan will be issued for Regulation 19 pre-submission consultation in late January 2021 or early February 2021 for a period of 6 weeks. Following consultation, the Plan would then be submitted, prior to the summer recess, to the Planning Inspectorate for Public Examination. The Director of the Built Environment will, if necessary,

compile a list of proposed non-material changes to the Local Plan arising out of the public representations, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee, and submit this to the Secretary of State. If material changes are necessary, this report seeks authority to delegate consideration of these changes to the Planning and Transportation Committee rather than referring the draft Plan back a third time to the Policy and Resources Committee and Court of Common Council. Formal Examination hearings are likely to take place later in 2021, with adoption of the new Local Plan now scheduled for 2022.

21. The Government recently consulted on fundamental changes to the planning system through its Planning White Paper. The White Paper suggests transitional provisions for those local planning authorities that have submitted a plan for public examination at the time the revised planning legislation is enacted which would allow a submitted local plan to continue progress to adoption. The timing of legislation is uncertain, but it is expected to be progressed quickly, highlighting the importance of ensuring that the City's Plan is submitted for examination in late spring/early summer 2021. Enabling delegated authority for the Planning and Transportation Committee to agree any proposed material changes to the Plan after public consultation will facilitate Plan submission in 2021 in advance of national changes to the plan preparation system.
22. The Government's Chief Planner has recently advised local planning authorities not to let current uncertainty over planning reform stop them from progressing work, particularly in respect to the preparation of plans. She emphasised that authorities should try not to lose momentum, adding that strong plans can help facilitate recovery from the pandemic as well as addressing housing needs and the economic challenges that lie ahead.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

23. The review of the Local Plan is informed by the Corporate Plan (2018-23) and the new Plan, when adopted, will help to implement a number of Corporate Plan outcomes. The Proposed Submission draft Plan provides a spatial planning framework to support the Climate Action Strategy and key corporate capital projects, along with proposals to ensure a sufficient supply of business space to meet future needs. It also aligns with the adopted Transport Strategy.
24. There are no financial, resource, legal, risk or security implications arising from this report.
25. Equalities implications – the Local Plan has been informed by an Integrated Impact Assessment which incorporates an Equalities Assessment.

Conclusion

26. The draft Local Plan was agreed for Regulation 19 pre-submission consultation by the Court of Common Council at its meeting on 21st May 2020. The Proposed

Submission version of City Plan 2036 is available at www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/cityplan2036. It is accompanied by two Policies Maps showing which policies apply to specific locations. Local Plan regulations at that time prevented consultation taking place without making physical copies of the Plan available for inspection. Amendments to the Regulations in July 2020 have now enabled a website only consultation.

27. Changes to permitted development rights and the Use Classes Order, which came into effect on 31st August and 1st September 2020, mean that further changes to the Proposed Submission draft Plan are now required to ensure it is compliant with national planning policy. Additional changes are needed to acknowledge the short-term impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, whilst emphasising that the medium to longer term fundamentals underpinning the City's economic success remain in place. The City Corporation has also adopted its Climate Action Strategy and updates are proposed to reflect the strategy. Other factual updates are also proposed.

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Schedule of proposed amendments to the Proposed Submission version of the City of London Local Plan.

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

DATED this 17th day of November 2020.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Deputy Alastair Moss
Chair, Planning and Transportation Committee

Schedule of proposed changes to the version of City Plan 2036 approved by Court of Common Council in May 2020		
Policy/paragraph	Proposed change	Reason for change
Introduction: Why is the City preparing a new Local Plan? Paragraph 1.2.3	Since the City's current Local Plan was adopted, the Government has made a number of changes to the planning system <u>through its planning reform agenda, with notable changes being made to permitted development rights and the Use Classes Order during 2020. As a result, a number of</u> and some policies need updating to ensure they remain up-to-date and responsive to national policy. In addition, the Mayor of London is reviewing the London Plan, which provides a strategic planning framework for London for the period up to 2041.	Factual update
Introduction: Figure 1 (after paragraph 1.3.3)	Update timetable in Figure 1 to indicate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication (Early 2021) • Submission (Spring/Summer 2021) • Examination (Winter 2021/22) • Adoption (Spring/Summer 2022) 	Factual update
Introduction: Policy context Paragraphs 1.3.5 – 1.3.6	<p>Policy context</p> <p>1.3.5. <u>This Plan is being prepared in an era of significant and rapid change and has been deliberately drafted to provide a flexible policy framework.</u> Within this wider framework, the Local Plan can provide an environment which encourages appropriate development and is responsive and adaptable to change.</p> <p><u>1.3.6 In particular, the Plan seeks to provide a flexible, resilient policy framework which responds to three fundamental health and well-being, environmental and economic influences: Covid-19, climate change, and the UK's departure from the European Union.</u></p>	To reflect impacts arising from the publication of the City Corporation's Climate Action Strategy, the Covid-19 pandemic, the London Recharged Report and updated trading relationships

	<p><u>Climate change</u></p> <p><u>1.3.7 The threat from climate change is one of the most serious threats we face today. It extends beyond environmental challenges and has the potential to affect economic prosperity, social justice and global stability. Wide ranging responses are essential, encompassing individual local actions, local, strategic and national government programmes, business and community scale initiatives and global agreements. Scientific evidence indicates that the climate is already changing, and that action is needed to limit global warming to 1.5 degrees.</u></p> <p><u>1.3.8 The City Corporation has long been a champion of clean air, open space provision, sustainability and, more recently, green finance, recognising that a healthy environment is critical to business and personal well-being. It has in 2020 adopted a Climate Action Strategy which sets out a pathway to achieving net zero emissions for both the City Corporation's activities and the wider activities of businesses and residents in the City of London. The Strategy and, more importantly, the actions outlined will ensure the Square Mile and City Corporation achieve net zero carbon by 2040 and make a positive contribution to tackling climate change, are resilient to the risks of climate change and seize the opportunities presented by the transition to a low-carbon economy.</u></p> <p><u>Covid-19 pandemic</u></p> <p><u>1.3.9 Much of this Plan was drafted prior to the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, which has had significant health, well-being, environmental and economic impacts locally and globally. As medical treatments are discovered and rolled out, including potential vaccines, the severity of these health impacts is expected to reduce and communities will recover in the medium term. However, the pandemic is also leading to behavioural changes; some are temporary, but some are likely to become established as part of the 'new normal'. The acceleration of existing trends and the creation of new trends both need to be taken into account when planning for the medium and longer</u></p>	
--	---	--

	<p><u>term. Therefore, the Plan is looking beyond the current pandemic to a period when a probable vaccine has enabled the City to once more provide a vibrant centre of business creativity and innovation which harnesses the potential of existing and new trends.</u></p> <p><u>1.3.10 Throughout its long history the City of London has been a centre for creative innovation and collaboration, bringing business and people together. The Covid-19 pandemic has in the short term shifted much of the City's business online with many City workers using modern technology to work from home, and consequently significant reductions in journeys into the City and footfall within it. Whilst the use of digital technology and remote working will remain important to the success of many City businesses in the future, reliance solely on remote working can have longer term drawbacks as it can limit the scope of the creative innovation, collaboration and informal business relationships that the City thrives upon. Therefore, it is expected that the City will remain an attractive base for a wide range of existing and new businesses, operating more flexibly with a blended approach of in-office and remote working, to meet the changing business environment, space needs and work and lifestyle expectations of their workforce. There is an opportunity to transform City workplaces to offer a rich and fulfilling experience for City workers, with the office becoming a place for socialising, meeting, sharing and collaboration. The return of City workers will bring vitality to provide a boost to businesses that rely on high footfall, including retail, food and beverage and support services to the City's offices, that have been particularly affected by Covid-19.</u></p> <p><u>1.3.11 Although the pace and scale of future growth in the City of London is uncertain in the short term, the longer term geographical, economic and social fundamentals underpinning the success of the City as a vibrant centre of business creativity and innovation remain in place. Strong interest in pre-application planning advice and investment suggest continued confidence in the City as a place in which to do business. The ways that people live, work, travel and use city centres will in the future be</u></p>	
--	---	--

	<p><u>different, but the City will continue to be an attractive and sustainable meeting place where people and businesses come together for creative innovation.</u></p> <p><u>1.3.xx The City Corporation will work closely with national, regional and local government, landowners and investors, businesses and residents to ensure that the City of London remains successful. It is acknowledged that the pandemic will have short and perhaps medium term financial implications for the City Corporation and for Transport for London, which may impact on, or delay, implementation of some policy aspirations and will need to be closely monitored. Nonetheless, this Plan will provide a framework to give confidence to those who wish to be involved in and to invest in the City and it has been written to be adaptable to new changes and challenges as they present themselves.</u></p> <p><u>UK trading relationships</u></p> <p><u>1.3.12 As a world leading financial and professional services centre, the future prosperity of the City will depend to a large extent on the international and national economic considerations and other external policies, particularly the United Kingdom's future trading relationship with the European Union and the rest of the world. context including future trading relationships. The UK's departure from the European Union is leading to new trading relationships and patterns. The City's reputation for expertise and innovation will be particularly important as it adapts its existing strengths in financial and professional services, and develops new strengths, to suit changing global circumstances.</u></p> <p>1.3.613. The Local Plan is influenced by national and London-wide planning policies and guidance, as well as plans and strategies produced by neighbouring boroughs and a range of statutory bodies.</p>	
--	--	--

Introduction: National planning policy and guidance New paragraph following current paragraph 1.3.7	<u>1.3.xx The Government's planning reform agenda has resulted in a number of changes to national legislation and guidance. These changes, including those brought forward during 2020 to permitted development rights and the Use Classes Order, have been incorporated into this Plan. The Government has published a Planning White Paper outlining further fundamental changes to the planning system in England which would impact upon the preparation and content of local plans and the operation of development management. These reforms, if enacted, will be considered through a subsequent review of the City of London's Local Plan.</u>	Factual update
Introduction: The London Plan and other Mayoral strategies Paragraph 1.3.8	1.3.8. The Mayor of London has a duty to prepare a spatial development strategy, the London Plan, and to keep it under review. The City's Local Plan, like those produced by the London boroughs, must be in general conformity with the London Plan. The London Plan forms part of the statutory development plan for the City of London, along with the City's Local Plan. <u>The Local Plan has been prepared in alignment with the Mayor's Intend to Publish London Plan (December 2019).</u>	Factual update
Introduction: City Corporation strategies Paragraph 1.3.15	1.3.15. In particular, the Local Plan is one of the mechanisms through which the City Corporation's Corporate Plan <u>and Climate Action Strategy</u> will be implemented. The Corporate Plan sets out the City Corporation's overarching strategic direction and is structured around the three pillars of society, economy and environment. Although the Corporate Plan has a shorter time horizon than the Local Plan (2018-23), it is a visionary and forward-looking document and City Plan 2036 complements and helps deliver many of its objectives. <u>The Climate Action Strategy set out the City Corporation's pathway to achieve a zero carbon City by 2040.</u>	Factual update
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.1 Contribute to a Flourishing Society	3.1.2. The City's population will enjoy good health and wellbeing. <u>The health and wellbeing of the City's communities will be integral to the design and delivery of new buildings, open spaces and the wider public realm, helping the City recover from the Covid-19 pandemic, provide inclusive and diverse spaces and address the implications of climate change.</u> Health inequality across the City will be reduced. Workers and residents	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic

Paragraph 3.1.2	will have access to a range of health services within the Square Mile and beyond. Partnership working with businesses and organisations both inside and outside the City will effectively tackle the wider causes of poor health by substantially improving the City's air quality, promoting the recreational benefits of a healthy lifestyle, and ensuring inclusive access to good quality open spaces and recreational opportunities.	
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.2 Support a Thriving Economy Paragraph 3.2.1	3.2.1. The City will remain the world's leading international financial and professional services centre and a driver of the national economy, continually innovating and developing new business areas <u>and flexible ways of working, including particularly</u> in the technology and creative sectors, and delivering inclusive and sustainable growth and prosperity for its communities, London and the UK.	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.2 Support a Thriving Economy Paragraph 3.2.3	3.2.3. The City will be open to new business, new ideas <u>and innovations</u> and new ways of working <u>and collaborating, building upon the experience and lessons learned through the Covid-19 pandemic. New reflected in office business</u> floorspace <u>that is will be</u> flexible and adaptable <u>to meet creating spaces for collaboration and innovation and meeting</u> the demands of different types of business occupiers <u>and their workforces</u> , including incubators, start-ups and other small and medium sized companies. <u>There is an opportunity for the City's cultural offer to be central to its recovery and future resilience.</u> Office space will be complemented by other accessible commercial, cultural and leisure uses adding vibrancy and animation to the City's streets and benefitting the City's diverse communities.	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic and the London Recharged Report
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.2 Support a Thriving Economy Paragraph 3.2.5	3.2.5. The <u>quality and quantity of City's retail facilities offer</u> will <u>adapt to changing demands, offering a range of meanwhile and complementary services to the City's wider business and cultural offer and contributing to the City's development as continue to increase to meet rising demand, as the City evolves into</u> an evening and 7-day a week retail, leisure and cultural destination. Retail growth will be focused on the Principal Shopping Centres of Cheapside, Liverpool Street/Moorgate, Leadenhall Market and Fleet	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

	Street. Smaller retail, <u>collaboration and cultural uses</u> units will be provided across the City, animating ground floor spaces and meeting local worker and resident needs.	
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.3 Shape Outstanding Environments Paragraph 3.3.2	3.3.2. The City's streets will provide an attractive and safe environment for walking and cycling. <u>Pavement widening and reallocation of road space for pedestrian or cycle use, allied with increased planting and greenery, will provide more space for moving around, building on the initiatives put in place during the Covid-19 pandemic.</u> Traffic reduction and improvements to the City's streets and junctions will transform the safety, look and feel of the City's street network.	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.3 Shape Outstanding Environments Paragraph 3.3.5	3.3.5. The City will remain a centre of world class architecture with flexible, and <u>and healthy</u> buildings and a high quality of public realm for people to admire and enjoy. Further tall buildings will be encouraged where they can make a positive contribution to their surroundings and the skyline <u>and provide for the health and wellbeing of workers,</u> adding to the tall building cluster in the east of the City.	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.3 Shape Outstanding Environments Paragraph 3.3.8	3.3.8. The City's buildings, public realm and transport will be highly sustainable, designed to make efficient use of natural resources, minimise emissions and be resilient to natural and man-made threats. In partnership with public and private sector organisations the City will adopt new technologies to transition to a zero emission City by 2050 <u>2040, in line with the ambitions set out in the City Corporation's Climate Action Strategy.</u>	Factual update
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.3 Shape Outstanding Environments	3.3.9. The City will be a much greener place, with additional planting in and around new and existing buildings and <u>the City's streets and</u> spaces, enhancing the environment, <u>contributing to health and wellbeing</u> and mitigating the impacts of pollution. New open and amenity spaces will be created including through the creation of new pedestrian routes, accessible and permeable buildings, and the provision of amenity space at upper or roof levels. Public access to private open space will be encouraged. Biodiversity will be	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic

Paragraph 3.3.9	increased by the inclusion of wildlife-friendly features in new and existing open spaces and buildings.	
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.3 Shape Outstanding Environments Paragraph 3.3.12	3.3.12. To shape the future City, ensuring that it is physically and virtually well connected, sustainable and responsive, resilient to natural and man-made threats, and delivers outstanding buildings, streets, public spaces, and heritage assets.	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Paragraphs 3.4.3, 7.5.2 & Strategic Policy S20	Change Sir John Cass School to <u>The Aldgate School</u>	Factual update
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.4 Key Areas of Change: City Cluster Paragraph 3.4.4	... Freight and servicing deliveries will be reduced through off-site consolidation, the re-timing of deliveries outside of peak hours and joint working with occupiers. Pedestrian movement and permeability will be improved and with priority given to pedestrians <u>through the reallocation of road space</u> on key routes during daytime. <u>Opportunities for cycling to, from and within the Cluster will be improved alongside measures to improve pedestrian access.</u> Links to public transport nodes and other parts of the City, including to the Elizabeth Line at Liverpool Street Station, will be improved.	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: 3.4 Key Areas of Change: Smithfield and Barbican Paragraph 3.4.6	... Consolidation of the City Corporation's wholesale markets onto a single site outside of the City will potentially allow the re-use of Smithfield Market <u>in whole or in part</u> for other uses compatible with its heritage status and the City Corporation's ambitions for Culture Mile. St Bartholomew's Hospital will remain a major centre of health excellence. <u>Additional greening, new open spaces and pedestrian and cycling priority in appropriate locations will reduce the</u> potential for conflict between vehicular access to commercial and residential uses, <u>and allowing for more effective management of</u> the increased numbers of pedestrians will be effectively managed.	Factual update to reflect progress on Smithfield Public Realm proposals

Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: Spatial Strategy Paragraph 3.5.2	3.5.2. The <u>Local Plan will be implemented alongside the policies and strategy of the London Plan and, particularly the London Plan's principles of Good Growth.</u> The City Plan 2036 Spatial Strategy and the detailed policies that follow set out how <u>this the balance between commercial, residential, cultural and environmental aspirations</u> will be delivered and how the City of London will become a healthy, socially and economically inclusive City for all.	To reflect advice from a Planning Inspector during an advisory visit, in which he commented that reference should be made to the London Plan in the Spatial Strategy
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: Spatial Strategy Paragraph 3.5.3	3.5.3. Table 1 shows the scale of the projected growth in the main land uses in the City over the period 2016 to 2036. <u>These projections pre-date the Covid-19 pandemic but the fundamental advantages and principles underpinning growth in the City remain and, over the longer term life of this Plan to 2036, growth is expected in line with the projections.</u>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Vision, Strategic Objectives and Spatial Strategy: Spatial Strategy	<p>The City Corporation will facilitate a vibrant, thriving and inclusive City, supporting a diverse and sustainable London within a globally successful UK.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensuring that the City is sustainable and transitions to a zero carbon and zero emission City by <u>2050 2040</u>, delivering further urban greening and improving air quality. 2. Delivering <u>sustainable growth following the Covid-19 pandemic including</u> a minimum of 2 million m² net additional office floorspace and protecting existing office floorspace to maintain the City's role as a world leading financial and professional services centre and to sustain the City's strategically important cluster of commercial activities within the Central Activities Zone. ... 5. Delivering at least <u>1,460 2,482</u> additional homes within the City by <u>2028/29 2035/36</u> to meet housing need and continuing to deliver new housing on City Corporation estates and other appropriate sites outside of the City. 	<p>Factual Update (point 1)</p> <p>To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic (point 2)</p> <p>To reflect advice from a Planning Inspector during an advisory visit (point 5)</p>

	...	
Strategic Policy S1 - Healthy and Inclusive City: New paragraph before paragraph 4.1.16	<p><u>4.1.xx. The design of buildings and spaces to maximise health outcomes is particularly important in light of the Covid-19 pandemic. The design of commercial buildings, outdoor spaces and residential developments should be flexible so that buildings and outdoor spaces can be reconfigured as necessary in response changing health and wellbeing requirements.</u></p> <p>4.1.16. Developers are encouraged to use established assessment methodologies to ensure that development contributes towards a healthy city. There are several accreditation systems that attempt to measure the health and well-being elements of building design, construction and operation and how these features impact on health and wellbeing.</p>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Strategic Policy S1 - Healthy and Inclusive City: New paragraph at end of sub-section 'How the policy works'	<p>Strategic Policy S1: Healthy and Inclusive City</p> <p>The City Corporation will work with a range of partners to create a healthy and inclusive environment, promote social and economic inclusivity and enable all communities to access a wide range of health, education, recreation and leisure opportunities, by:</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. Encouraging the further provision of both public and private health facilities. <u>Conditions may be attached to permissions for public healthcare facilities to ensure their future retention;</u></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>4.1.xx. Changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020 have included certain health and medical services such as clinics, health centres, creches, day nurseries and day centres within the new Use Class E. This means that such uses could be converted to a range of other Class E commercial, business and service uses without</u></p>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

	<u>planning permission. Given the limited opportunities to replace such facilities in the City, conditions may be attached to permissions for new public health facilities to ensure that the impacts of any proposed later conversion to another use can be considered through the planning application process. Conditions will not be applied to private healthcare facilities.</u>	
Policy HL2 - Air Quality	<p>Policy HL2: Air Quality</p> <p>1. Developers will be required to effectively manage the impact of their proposals on air quality. Major developments must provide an Air Quality Impact Assessment.</p> <p>2. Development that would result in a worsening of the City's nitrogen dioxide or PM10 and PM2.5 pollution levels will be <u>strongly resisted</u>refused.</p> <p>...</p>	To reflect advice from a Planning Inspector during an advisory visit, in which he commented that the current wording may not be realistic and that elsewhere in the Plan, the term 'resisted' is used
Policy HL5 - Location and protection of social and community facilities: Paragraph 4.1.37	4.1.37. Social and community facilities contribute to successful communities by providing venues for a wide range of activities and services. As such they make a significant contribution to people's mental, spiritual and physical well-being, sense of community, learning and education. Library and educational facilities and those that support the City's business and cultural roles are particularly important. <u>A definition of social and community facilities, with reference to the Use Classes Order, is provided in the glossary.</u>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020
Policy HL7 - Sport and recreation: New paragraph after paragraph 4.1.49	4.1.49. The City Corporation will protect existing public sports and recreation facilities in situ, where there is a need, and encourage the provision of new public and private facilities. Where in situ provision is not feasible, services should be delivered from other facilities without reducing the level of provision. However, any proposals involving the loss of public sport and recreational facilities must be accompanied by evidence of a lack of need for those facilities. Current public facilities and uses should be retained where a	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

	<p>continuing need exists. If this is not feasible, preference will be given to a similar type of sport and recreational use in the first instance.</p> <p><i>[moved to new paragraph]</i></p> <p><u>4.1.xx.</u> The loss of private facilities such as gyms through redevelopment or change of use will be permitted where the replacement uses meet other objectives in this Plan.</p> <p><u>Following changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020, existing gyms and other indoor recreational uses could be converted to a range of alternative Class E commercial, business and service uses without planning permission, unless there are specific planning conditions attached to a site which prevent this.</u></p>	
Policy HL9 - Health Impact Assessment (HIA): Paragraph 4.1.54	<p>4.1.54 HIAs provide a systematic framework to identify the potential impacts of a development proposal on the health and wellbeing of the population and highlight any health inequalities that may arise. <u>The Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted the important role that health impact assessments can play in enabling developers to understand and plan for potential risks to health and wellbeing.</u></p>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Strategic Policy S2 - Safe and Secure City	<p>Strategic Policy S2: Safe and Secure City</p> <p>The City Corporation will work with the City of London Police and the London Fire Brigade to ensure that the City is secure from crime, disorder and terrorism, and is able to accommodate large numbers of people safely and efficiently by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimising the potential for crime and anti-social behaviour by <u>ensuring that development proposals</u> designing out crime and encouraging a mix of uses and natural surveillance of streets and spaces; 2. Implementing measures to enhance the collective security of the City against terrorist threats, applying security measures to broad areas such as the Traffic and Environmental Zone, major development schemes, or to the City as a whole; 	To reflect advice from a Planning Inspector during an advisory visit, in which he commented that it was unclear whether or not some parts of Policy S1 are intended to apply to development proposals.

	<p>3. Developing area-based approaches to implementing security measures where major developments are planned or are under construction simultaneously, and in locations where occupiers have requested collective security measures;</p> <p>4. Ensuring that development proposals take Taking account of the need for resilience in developments so that residential and business communities are better prepared for, and better able to recover from, emergencies (including the promotion of business continuity measures);</p> <p>5. Requiring development proposals to meet the highest standards of fire safety. Major development proposals must prepare and submit a Fire Statement setting out how the development will address fire safety in the design, construction and operation of the building.</p>	
Strategic Policy S3 - Housing: Paragraphs 4.3.6 – 4.3.8	<p>Strategic Policy S3: Housing</p> <p>The City Corporation will protect existing housing and amenity and encourage additional housing concentrated in or near the identified residential areas to meet the City's needs, by:</p> <p>1. Making provision for a minimum of 1,460 2,482 net additional dwellings between 2019/20 and 2028/29 2035/36:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encouraging new housing development on appropriate sites in or near identified residential areas; • protecting existing housing where it is of a suitable quality and in a suitable location; • exceptionally, allowing the loss of isolated residential units where there is a poor level of amenity; and 	To reflect advice from a Planning Inspector during an advisory visit, in which he commented that the housing requirement needs to be identified for the whole Plan period up to 2036 (albeit for the period after 2028/29 this may need to alter to ensure general conformity with any subsequent review of the London Plan)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • refusing new housing where it would prejudice the primary business function of the City or be contrary to Policy OF2. <p>....</p> <p>Housing requirement</p> <p>4.3.6 The NPPF sets out a standardised approach to assessing housing need and requires strategic planning authorities to follow this approach in setting housing targets in Local Plans. The City of London Local Plan is required to be in general conformity with the London Plan, which sets a housing target for the City and the London boroughs.</p> <p><i>[moved to new paragraph]</i></p> <p><u>4.3.xx.</u> The London Plan strategic framework includes Policy SD5, which indicates that residential development is inappropriate in the commercial core of the City of London. Within this context, it requires the City of London to deliver 1,460 new homes during the period 2019/20 – 2028/29, with the annual average rate continuing beyond 2028/29 until such time as the London Plan is further reviewed. <u>In Policy S3 the City's housing requirement is expressed as a total of 2,482 dwellings for the Plan period to 2036, which represents the 10-year London Plan target of 1,460 dwellings plus the combined annual average of 146 dwellings for the seven years post 2028/29 (1,022 dwellings). The housing requirement beyond 2028/29 will be kept under review and may need to alter to ensure general conformity with any subsequent review of the London Plan.</u> The London Plan also includes a target that 740 units should be provided on small sites of less than 0.25 hectares in size over the 2019/20 – 2028/29 period.</p> <p>4.3.7 Different assessment methods provide different figures for local housing need. The City's 2016 SHMA assessed the level of housing need, including the needs of those requiring supported and specialised accommodation in the City, over the period 2014-36, using the latest population and household projections. The SHMA identified an objectively assessed need for an annual average of 126 dwellings per year. Using the national standard method for assessing local housing need <u>at the time of preparing this Plan</u>, the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>City's minimum annual local housing need figure over the ten-year period from 2020 to 2030 would be 112.</p> <p>4.3.8 ...The City Corporation recognises that the wider housing needs across London support the case for a higher level of housing in the City than indicated by the City's SHMA. This Local Plan therefore seeks to meet the London Plan housing target of 1,460 dwellings, <u>which has been applied to the whole of the Local Plan period as explained above.</u></p>	
Strategic Policy S3 - Housing	<p>Strategic Policy S3: Housing</p> <p>The City Corporation will protect existing housing and amenity and encourage additional housing concentrated in or near the identified residential areas to meet the City's needs, by:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Ensuring sufficient affordable housing is provided to meet the City's housing need and contributing to London's wider housing needs by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensuring the delivery of a minimum of 50% affordable housing on public sector land; and requiring residential developments with the potential for more than 10 <u>or more</u> units to provide a minimum of 35% affordable housing on-site. Exceptionally, new affordable housing may be provided off-site, or through an equivalent cash-in lieu payment, if evidence is provided to the City Corporation's satisfaction that on-site provision cannot be satisfactorily delivered and is not viable; and providing a mix of affordable tenures, addressing identified need in the City of London, including social or London affordable rented housing and intermediate housing (living rent, shared ownership or other genuinely affordable products) for rent or sale. 	To ensure consistency with the London Plan, which has changed

<p>Strategic Policy S3 - Housing: New paragraphs following paragraph 4.3.12</p>	<p>4.3.12 The City Corporation will continue to support the delivery of new market and affordable housing on its own housing estates and other appropriate land holdings outside the Square Mile in fulfilment of its ambition to deliver a significant number of new homes and contribute towards the delivery of new housing to meet London's wider housing needs.</p> <p><i>[moved from current paragraph 4.3.8]</i></p> <p><u>4.3.xx. The City Corporation is the strategic housing authority for the City of London and a landlord responsible for over 1,900 social tenanted properties and over 900 leaseholder properties across London.</u> The City Corporation provides over 1,500 social housing units on 11 estates <u>that it owns and manages</u> outside of the City of London in <u>the six London boroughs of</u> Southwark, Islington, Lewisham, Lambeth, Hackney and Tower Hamlets. This is in addition to social housing provided within the City.</p> <p><u>4.3.xx. The City Corporation has committed to play a leading role in tackling the housing shortage in London with a pledge to build hundreds of new social homes and thousands of additional mixed tenure homes.</u> The City Corporation's Housing Strategy 2019-23 aims to deliver at least 700 new <u>social</u> homes on City-owned land and housing estates <u>with potential for renewal and expansion.</u> Where these homes are outside of the City, the City Corporation normally seeks joint nomination rights with the host borough to ensure that the housing can meet address both City of London and host borough housing need. The City Corporation as a strategic landowner across London is seeking to deliver a further 3,000 mixed tenure homes on other sites in partnership with other providers, in recognition of the need for additional housing across London to meet housing needs.</p> <p><u>4.3.xx. The City Corporation's plans to build new homes have encouraged both public and private sector partners to propose development opportunities and potential joint ventures. Options to increase the supply of new homes beyond the City Corporation's own sites are being explored. The planned co-location of the City Corporation owned and managed wholesale markets (Smithfield Meat Market, Billingsgate Fish Market and</u></p>	<p>To reflect advice from a Planning Inspector during an advisory visit, in which he commented that the Plan could provide a clearer narrative on how the City Corporation is meeting housing needs on land outside the City of London</p>
---	---	--

	<u>New Spitalfields Fruit and Vegetable Market) onto one site in Dagenham would provide an opportunity for mixed use redevelopment which could include housing. Billingsgate is a 5-hectare site next to Canary Wharf and New Spitalfields is a 13-hectare site in Leyton.</u>	
Policy HS4 - Housing Quality Standards	<p>Policy HS4: Housing quality standards</p> <p>All new housing must be of a high-quality design and of a standard that facilitates the health and well-being of occupants and neighbouring occupants, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meets London Plan housing space standards; • meets standards for Secured by Design or similar certification; and • maximises opportunities for providing <u>communal</u> open and leisure space for residents; <u>and</u> • <u>provides amenity space for individual units, where possible including outdoor space.</u> 	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Policy HS8 - Older Persons Housing: Paragraph 4.3.62	<p>Policy HS8: Older persons housing</p> <p>The City Corporation will aim to ensure there is a sufficient supply of appropriate housing available for older people by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>making provision for a minimum of 170 net additional dwellings for older persons between 2019/20 and 2035/36;</u> • supporting development that meets the specific needs of older people; 	To reflect advice from a Planning Inspector during an advisory visit, in which he commented that the Local Plan should reflect the London Plan's City benchmark for specialist older persons housing of 10 units per year

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting development that replaces existing provision for older people with better provision that addresses care needs or fosters independent living; • ensuring new development is inclusive and accessible to all to allow people to continue living in their own homes; • resisting development that involves the net loss of housing for older people. <p>...</p> <p>4.3.62 The City Corporation will work with developers to encourage the provision of sufficient accommodation suitable for older people, including provision of specialist older persons accommodation, where feasible, to meet identified needs. <u>Housing suitable for older persons, including sheltered housing, is provided by the City Corporation on its land and estates, inside and outside of the City. Provision outside the City may assist in meeting the need for older persons housing for City residents through nomination rights.</u> Specialist older persons housing should deliver affordable housing in line with Strategic Policy S3. Some older or disabled residents may need regular visits from carers and healthcare professionals and the provision of visitor parking would support their ability to live in their own homes. This issue is addressed in Policy VT3.</p>	
Offices – context: Paragraphs 5.1.5 - 5.16	<p>5.1.5. The City lies wholly within London’s Central Activity Zone (CAZ) where the London Plan promotes further economic and employment growth. <u>Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, the GLA projected that City of London employment will grow by 116,000 from 2016 to 2036, of which approximately 103,000 employees are estimated to be office based. London’s rapidly growing population will also create the demand for more employment and for the space required to accommodate it.</u></p> <p><u>5.1.xx. The Covid-19 pandemic is having significant health, wellbeing, social and economic impacts globally. The City of London has not been immune to these impacts and has seen a significant shift in working patterns to flexible and remote working, with</u></p>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic and the London Recharged Report

	<p><u>major reductions in City footfall and use of the City's retail, leisure and cultural assets. Flexible working patterns are likely to continue in some form for most businesses and employees post Covid, within a blended approach to office working. The likely reduction in office occupation densities due to Covid presents an opportunity for City offices and businesses to reinvent themselves and the way that they work. Economic modelling by the GLA suggests a gradual return of economic activity and a return to economic and employment growth. At the same time, the fundamentals underpinning the City's success, its locational advantages and the benefits of collaboration and co-operation remain. Alongside continued investor and developer interest in the City as a place in which to do business, these fundamentals suggest that the City will continue to prosper and, over the life of this Plan, will see further employment growth and a need for additional office, creative and collaboration space.</u></p> <p>5.1.6. The United Kingdom's exit from the European Union will <u>also</u> have short and long-term effects on economic and employment growth depending on the detail of future trading arrangements. Whatever those arrangements London's strong underlying strengths mean that it is necessary to plan for continued growth to ensure that the City remains a global financial and professional services centre.</p> <p><u>5.1.xx. The City Corporation will continually review employment and office growth trends and the economic impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic and the UK's departure from the European Union and will bring forward a review of this Plan to address changing trends, where necessary.</u></p>	
Strategic Policy S4 - Offices: New paragraph after paragraph 5.1.7	5.1.7. The City of London is a world leading international financial and professional services centre and has a nationally important role in the economy. To maintain this position, it is vital to ensure that sufficient office floorspace is available to meet projected employment growth and occupier demand and that additional office development is of high quality and suitable for a variety of occupiers. The overall office floorspace target of	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic and the London Recharged Report

	<p>2,000,000m² is derived from the estimated growth in office employment between 2016 and 2036 and represents a 23% increase in floorspace.</p> <p><u>5.1.xx. Notwithstanding the short term impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on occupier demand and construction activity, the City has a robust development pipeline. In March 2020, approximately two-thirds of the total office floorspace target had either been completed since the baseline date of 2016 or was under construction. While the long term impacts of the pandemic on the office market are uncertain, flexible working has become a key part of the business environment and it seems likely that many City workers will choose to spend at least part of the week working remotely rather than from the office. However, this trend is expected to be counteracted by a shift towards lower occupation densities and the provision of more breakout space within offices. The overall impact on floorspace demand may therefore be broadly neutral.</u></p>	
Strategic Policy S4 - Offices	<p>Strategic Policy S4: Offices</p> <p>The City Corporation will facilitate significant growth in office development of the highest quality to meet projected economic and employment growth by:</p> <p>....2. Ensuring that new floorspace is designed to be flexible to allow <u>the transformation and</u> adaptation of space <u>to support new uses and</u> for different types and sizes of occupiers and to meet the needs of SMEs, <u>innovative and</u> start-up companies and those requiring move-on accommodation.</p> <p>....4. Protecting existing office stock from being lost to other uses where there is an identified need or where the loss would cause harm to the primary business function of the City. <u>Where necessary, conditions may be attached to permissions for new office floorspace to secure its long-term use for such purposes.</u></p>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020 and the London Recharged Report
Strategic Policy S4 – Offices:	5.1.13. The City Corporation has made an Article 4 Direction removing permitted development rights for the change of use of offices (B1a) to dwelling houses (C3) across	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order

New paragraph after paragraph 5.1.13	<p>the whole of the City. The Direction is consistent with the approach to office development and protection of offices set out in this Plan.</p> <p><u>5.1.xx. Changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020 mean that offices could be converted to a range of other Class E commercial, business and service uses without planning permission. Given that the largest past losses of office accommodation in the City have been to residential or visitor accommodation uses, this change is not expected to pose a significant risk to the City's strategic role as a centre for financial and professional services. However, where permission is granted for office schemes that meet a specific identified need, conditions may be attached to ensure the impacts of any proposed later conversion of such space can be considered through the planning application process.</u></p>	introduced in September 2020
Policy OF1 - Office Development: Paragraph 5.1.15	<p>5.1.15. Offices are the predominant land use in the City, but complementary uses are required to provide supporting activities and services for businesses, workers and residents in appropriate locations within the City. Complementary uses which contribute to the City's economy include retail, leisure, education, health facilities and cultural uses. A mix of commercial land uses, in particular at ground floor and basement levels, may create active frontages enhancing an area's vitality and provide important complementary services. <u>They also provide opportunities for creativity, collaboration and social interaction, which are key to the success of the City's business clusters.</u></p>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Policy OF2 - Protection of Existing Office Floorspace: Paragraph 5.1.18	<p>5.1.18. The protection of existing offices is important to ensure that there is a range of office stock to provide choice in terms of location and cost to potential occupiers. Proposals involving the loss of office accommodation <u>that require planning permission</u> will need to be supported by robust evidence of marketing and viability to ensure that viable offices can be retained to meet future office need. <u>Following changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020, existing offices could be converted to a range of other Class E commercial, business and service uses without planning</u></p>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

	<u>permission, unless there are specific planning conditions attached to a site which prevent this.</u>	
Policy OF3 - Temporary Meanwhile Use of Offices: Paragraphs 5.1.27- 5.1.28	<p>Policy OF3: Temporary 'Meanwhile' Uses of Offices</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Temporary use of vacant office commercial, business and service buildings or and sites ('meanwhile' uses) will be permitted where the proposed use would not result in adverse impacts on the amenity of the surrounding area or the primary business role of the City. Where temporary permission is granted it will be for a period not exceeding 36 months and the site will revert to office use thereafter. 2. Residential development is not considered an appropriate meanwhile use and will not be permitted. <p><u>Reason for the policy</u></p> <p>5.1.27. Where office buildings or sites in Class E commercial, business or service uses are vacant, and development is not expected in the short term, 'meanwhile' or temporary uses will be supported to ensure the vitality and vibrancy of the City is maintained, subject to the impact on surrounding uses.</p> <p><u>How the policy works</u></p> <p>5.1.28 'Meanwhile' uses will be granted subject to conditions for a maximum of 36 months, after which the use will revert to office its prior lawful use. Applications to extend the period of the 'meanwhile' use or make it permanent will be considered against the criteria in Policy OF2 relevant policies in the Development Plan and will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated that the permanent loss of office floorspace the prior lawful use is acceptable.</p>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

Retailing – context: Paragraph 5.2.3	<p>5.2.3 The ways in which people shop and use retail facilities is-are changing and the City’s retail offer needs to adapt to address changing consumer and leisure habits, whilst also retaining a focus on centres as places to shop. <u>The Covid-19 pandemic has significantly reduced footfall in town centres and retail centres nationally and hastened the growth of online retailing, having short-term impacts on the vitality and viability of many retail and leisure facilities.</u> Retail centres that provide a diverse range of <u>town centre uses, including</u> shops, services, <u>creative</u> and leisure activities are likely to be in a better position to respond to changing retail demand <u>and recover from the impacts of Covid-19.</u> In the City, as elsewhere, there has been an expansion of <u>experiential retail</u>, leisure, and entertainment <u>and mixed</u> uses, which can increase footfall at different times of the day and add to the visitor experience. Such uses are an important component of the City’s overall retail mix.</p>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Strategic Policy S5 – Retailing: Paragraphs 5.2.4 – 5.2.8	<p>Strategic Policy S5: Retailing</p> <p>The City Corporation will seek to improve the quantity and quality of retailing and the retail environment, promoting the development of the City’s four Principal Shopping Centres (PSCs) and the linkages between them by:</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. Supporting proposals that contribute towards the delivery of a minimum of 196,000 m² gross of additional retail floorspace across the City to meet future demand up to 2036.</p> <p>...</p> <p>5. Giving greater priority to <u>Focusing comparison and convenience</u> shops (A1 uses) within the PSCs, with a broader mix of retail and appropriate town centre uses on the peripheries of the centres and the Retail Links.</p> <p>...</p> <p>5.2.4 Four Principal Shopping Centres (PSCs) have been identified which provide a variety of comparison and convenience shopping, largely falling within the A1 use class, in the City of London: Cheapside, Fleet Street, Leadenhall Market and Moorgate/Liverpool</p>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic and changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

	<p>Street. Cheapside PSC is considered to be the City's 'high street' and has seen the most significant retail development in recent years. Moorgate/Liverpool Street PSC has potential to accommodate significant further retail floorspace, capitalising on the opening of the Elizabeth Line and becoming a key retail destination.</p> <p>5.2.5 The floorspace target is based on a <u>A</u> Retail Needs Assessment <u>undertaken in 2017</u> which identified a need for <u>approximately 200,000 m²</u> 196,000 m² of additional retail floorspace up to 2036. <u>This is an aspirational target based principally on projected employment growth in the City. The reduction in footfall and the increase in online retailing as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic has reduced retail activity in the City, at least in the short term. The introduction of a Commercial, Business and Service use class, Class E, which replaces previous A1, A2 and A3 uses, reduces the City Corporation's ability to manage the mix of retail uses. These changes are likely to impact on the projected level of retail growth. Nevertheless, the fundamental economic indicators underpinning the Local Plan remain and the patterns of growth identified in the Retail Needs Assessment remain valid.</u> The Assessment identifies the potential for significant retail growth in and around the PSCs, with a focus on potential growth around Moorgate/Liverpool Street. Some growth is anticipated to come forward outside the PSCs, near them or along the Retail Links.</p> <p>...</p> <p>5.2.7 There are further opportunities to develop the City's retail offer, allowing for a broad mix of retail facilities while maintaining a predominance of <u>A1 comparison and convenience</u> retail uses. The role and status of the four PSCs will be strengthened, encouraging further <u>retail A1</u> development, enhancing the retail offer in the City, supporting its primary business function and the growing cultural activity within the City. Improvements to pedestrian links and the retail offer within the Retail Links will encourage shoppers to move between the PSCs by making these connecting routes more interesting</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>and convenient to explore <u>enabling increased activity along these connecting routes, and creating a welcoming and vibrant environment.</u></p> <p>5.2.8. Major retail development, defined as development over 2,500m² gross floorspace, should locate within PSCs, but where suitable sites are not available sites on the edge of the PSCs or on identified Retail Links should be considered before other areas of the City. Smaller scale retail development will be encouraged throughout the City, where it provides an active frontage and facilities which meet the needs of the City's working population or local residents. Particular encouragement will be given to <u>A1 convenience retail</u> uses near to residential areas that serve the needs of residents.</p>	
Policy RE1 - Principal Shopping Centres: Paragraphs 5.2.11 - 5.2.16	<p>Policy RE1: Principal Shopping Centres</p> <p>1. Principal Shopping Centres (PSCs) are designated frontages on the Policies Map. Sites or buildings that form part of a designated frontage are considered to be part of the PSC in their entirety.</p> <p>2. The role of the PSCs as concentrations of <u>A1-comparison and convenience</u> shopping will be retained. The loss of ground floor retail frontages and/or floorspace will be resisted and additional retail provision, predominantly A1 shops, of varied unit sizes and frontage lengths will be encouraged, <u>supported by complementary uses that increase footfall and provide active frontages. Where planning permission is required, Pp</u> proposals for changes between retail uses within the PSCs will be assessed against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the contribution the unit makes to the function and character of the PSC; and • the effect of the proposal on the area in terms of the size of the unit, the length of its frontage, the composition and distribution of retail uses within the frontage and the location of the unit within the frontage. <p>3. Proposals for the change of use from shops (A1) to other Class A and appropriate town centre uses at upper floor and basement levels will normally be permitted, where they do not detract from the functioning of the centre or amenity.</p>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020 and the importance of partnership working

	<p>...</p> <p>5.2.11. Retailing comprises shops (A1), financial and professional services such as banks (A2), restaurants and cafes (A3), drinking establishments (A4) and hot food takeaways (A5). Retail uses within the PSCs are predominantly A1 comparison and convenience uses and the City Corporation considers that this predominance should continue, <u>supported by other town centre uses that provide activity at street level and create a welcoming and attractive environment for people to shop, access services and spend leisure time.</u></p> <p>5.2.12. <u>Following changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020, existing shops, premises providing financial and professional services to the public, and restaurants and cafes could be converted to a range of other Class E commercial, business and service uses without planning permission, unless there are specific planning conditions attached to a site which prevent this.</u> When considering proposals <u>Where planning permission is required</u> for changes between retail uses, the City Corporation will require the provision of active retail frontages onto the street and will also assess the contribution the unit makes to the character of the PSC as a whole and its frontage; for example, A1-retail units that are large or in prominent locations should be retained in A1-retail use. The net loss of ground floor A1-uses within the PSCs will be resisted. The net loss of other retail uses to non-retail uses within the identified PSC frontages could compromise the vitality of the PSCs and will also be resisted. Exceptionally, permission may be granted for non-retail, appropriate town centre uses such as leisure in the PSCs, providing these are complementary to the core retail offer and incorporate active frontages with an element of retail sales space. A1 units at upper floors and basement levels may contribute to the retail provision of PSCs. However, it is recognised that pressure on ground floor shop units may be reduced by locating other retail and town centre uses at non-ground level. Change of use from shops to other retail or town centre uses at upper floors or basements will be assessed in relation to the contribution the unit makes to the character of the PSC and the effect of the proposed entrance and use on the ground floor frontage.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>5.2.13. Proposals for additional retail development in the PSCs should incorporate a range of unit sizes and frontage lengths to help provide a more diverse retail offer, whilst retaining a predominance of A1 comparison and convenience shopping uses. <u>Where necessary to retain a critical mass of retail provision within the PSCs, conditions may be attached to permissions for new retail development to ensure that the impacts of any proposed later conversion of such space to non-retail uses can be considered through the planning application process.</u> Retail uses can generate significant numbers of delivery trips and retail development proposals will be required to demonstrate how delivery and servicing requirements have been addressed in the design process.</p> <p>...</p> <p>5.2.15 Cheapside is currently the largest PSC in the City and serves a wider catchment area than the other centres. The PSC includes Bow Lane, the ground floor of One New Change, Cheapside and Poultry. The PSC has undergone significant redevelopment since 2011 and the strategy is to reinforce its role and character as the City's 'High Street', maintaining a clear predominance of A1 retail units with a focus on comparison goods and food and drinks provision. There is scope for greater weekend trading and for some additional retail floorspace, particularly to link the western part of Cheapside with Culture Mile. <u>The City Corporation will work with the Cheapside Business Alliance to promote Cheapside as a shopping, business and visitor destination and to support its evolution into a seven day a week destination.</u> Timed restrictions on vehicular access to Bank Junction and the potential for future public realm improvements provide an opportunity to achieve greater pedestrian movement and retail links between Cheapside and retail activity within the Royal Exchange and further east.</p> <p>5.2.16 Fleet Street is the smallest PSC and predominantly serves the needs of nearby workers and residents with a limited number of premises open in the evenings or at weekends. The PSC has a linear form and the busy road creates a poor environment and acts as a barrier to pedestrian permeability. Improvements to the public realm would help</p>	
--	--	--

	to improve the environment and the visitor and shopper experience. The current retail stock is largely A1 food retail, and there is an opportunity to capitalise on the comparatively lower rents...	
Policy RE2 - Retail Links: Paragraph 5.2.22	<p>Policy RE2: Retail Links</p> <p>Within the Retail Links, the net loss of <u>active retail</u> frontages and floorspace will be resisted, <u>including the loss of retail facilities</u>, and additional retail development will be supported. A mix of shops and other retail and town centre uses will be encouraged in the Retail Links, ensuring that the location and balance of uses does not adversely affect the function of the Link, any nearby PSC or their surrounding areas.</p> <p>...</p> <p>5.2.22. While the mix of uses in the Links should include <u>comparison and convenience</u> A1 shops, a variety of other retail and town centre uses will be permitted, where there is no detrimental or cumulative effect on the amenity of neighbouring residential or business premises, such as through litter, noise, disturbance and odours. All <u>development proposals for change of use</u> in the Retail Links <u>should</u> will be required to incorporate active frontages at street level.</p>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020
Policy RE3 - Ground floor retail provision elsewhere in the City: Paragraphs 5.2.23 – 5.2.24	<p>Policy RE3: Ground floor retail provision elsewhere in the City</p> <p>1. Retail uses will be encouraged at ground floor level across the City provided they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include active frontages onto the street; • do not impact adversely on the amenity of residents, workers and visitors; • do not impact adversely on the operation of office premises; and • would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of the PSCs or Retail Links. <p>2. The loss of A1 convenience retail units that meet a local residential need will be resisted unless it is demonstrated that they are no longer required.</p>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

	<p><u>Reason for the policy</u></p> <p>5.2.23. Retail units outside of PSCs and Retail Links provide local facilities for the City's workforce, enhance the City's vibrancy, and may serve the City's residential communities. Given that most of the City's retail provision is tailored towards City workers, it is important to retain A1 units such as convenience stores that are within easy walking distance of the residential areas <u>and meet the day to day needs of surrounding communities. Unless they are subject to specific planning conditions, such units could be converted to any Class E commercial, business and service use without planning permission.</u></p> <p><u>How the policy works</u></p> <p>5.2.24. The provision of new retail units, particularly A1 comparison and convenience units, at ground floor level in existing and new development will be encouraged where these units do not have an adverse impact on the operation of office premises, provide an active frontage onto the street and do not have an adverse impact on the amenity of residents, workers or visitors by reason of noise, smells or fumes from the operation of the unit or servicing and deliveries. Use of ground floors for retail provides the opportunity to create more permeable buildings which can assist in reducing pressure for space on City streets.</p>	
Policy RE4 - Specialist retail uses: Paragraph 5.2.26	<p>5.2.26. The City Corporation will resist proposals which result in the permanent loss of work with owners, developers and occupiers to retain specialist retail uses and premises, unless where it can be demonstrated that such uses are of <u>are no longer required or can be re-provided on a suitable, alternative site which retains any</u> historical or cultural significance. <u>The City Corporation may attach conditions to planning permissions to ensure the retention or the</u> replacement of specialist facilities on the same site will be required where they are impacted by development proposals.</p>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

<p>Policy RE5 – Markets: Paragraph 5.2.27</p>	<p>Policy RE5: Markets</p> <p>Proposals for markets and temporary retail pop-ups will be permitted <u>encouraged</u> where they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are of an appropriate scale and frequency for their location; • would not have a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of existing retail centres within or outside the City; • would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or business occupiers; • would not unduly obstruct pedestrian and vehicular movement; and • would not involve the permanent loss of open space or harm the character of that space. <p>5.2.27 There is an increasing demand for temporary retail pop-ups and street food markets, such as the Guildhall Yard Lunch Market, which can support the local economy by generating increased vibrancy, retail diversity and footfall. These uses provide greater retail choice, enliven the public realm and increase the attractiveness of the City as a place to live, work and visit. <u>Pop-up and meanwhile uses can minimise vacancies of retail premises while a long-term occupier is sought, and may be used to animate areas where construction works are taking place.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>5.2.30. Proposals for markets or temporary retail pop-ups located within a building or its curtilage, should be ancillary to and complement the main use of the site. When assessing proposals for new <u>permanent</u> markets and <u>opportunities for</u> pop-ups, the City Corporation will consider the potential for significant adverse impacts on existing retail centres <u>the trade of retailers occupying fixed units</u> within the vicinity together with impacts on the amenity of nearby residents or business occupiers, on pedestrian and vehicular movement or on open spaces.</p>	<p>To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic</p>
---	---	--

<p>Strategic Policy S6: Culture, Visitors and the Night-Time Economy: Bullet point 1, and paragraph 5.3.8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing, supporting, encouraging access to and further developing a wide range of creative and cultural spaces and facilities across the City, and delivering a major destination for culture and creativity in the north west of the City through the Culture Mile initiative. <p>5.3.8 Developers will be required to submit Cultural Plans as part of planning applications for major developments. These should set out how the development will contribute towards enriching and enhancing the City's creative and cultural offer, for example, by incorporating cultural activities or displays in ground floor spaces; facilitating public access and providing exhibitions/interpretation boards in relation to matters of historic interest; providing permanent or temporary space for creative enterprises; and incorporating public art either within the design of the building or as freestanding structures. Further information on the content of Cultural Plans will be set out in an SPD.</p>	<p>Clarification</p>
<p>Policy CV1 - Protection of existing visitor, arts and cultural facilities: New paragraph after paragraph 5.3.10</p>	<p>5.3.10 There are many cultural facilities that are unique to the City and maintain an historic or cultural association with the Square Mile. Special consideration needs to be given to the protection of these facilities to maintain the City's unique cultural heritage. Examples of such facilities include City Livery Halls, public houses which have a heritage, cultural, economic or social value to local communities, theatres, museums, churches and specialist retail premises such as the Silver Vaults in Chancery Lane.</p> <p><u>5.3.xx. Some cultural facilities fall within broad categories of land use under the Use Classes Order, enabling the change of use of any one land use to another within that class without requiring planning permission. For instance, museums, places of worship and exhibition halls all fall within Use Class F.1 (Learning and non-residential institutions). However, other uses such as theatres, concert halls and public houses are classed as sui generis, meaning that planning permission would be required to change them to any alternative use.</u></p>	<p>To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020</p>

Policy CV2 – Provision of Visitor Facilities: Bullet point 6	<p>Policy CV2: Provision of Visitor Facilities</p> <p>The provision of facilities that meet the needs of visitors in new cultural developments and in nearby open spaces and the public realm will be encouraged, including:</p> <p>....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> temporary pop-up art installations, <u>galleries and spaces</u> in appropriate locations; 	London Recharged Report
Policy CV3 – Hotels: Paragraph 5.3.15	<p>5.3.15 While the majority of visitors are day-trippers, the City has seen strong demand for hotel accommodation in the last ten years, and in 2019 had 38 hotels, apart-hotels and hostels, providing 6,100 bedrooms. The GLA has forecast the need for an additional 58,146 bedrooms in London between 2015 and 2041. This demand is driven by a projected increase of 42 million international visitor nights and a 15 million increase in domestic visitor nights. The City’s projected share of this increase is 4,341 rooms. Based on past trends and hotel sites currently permitted or under construction, there is a strong likelihood that the City will meet the London Plan requirement. <u>It should be noted that these GLA forecasts predate the Covid-19 pandemic but although there have been short term impacts on the tourism industry, the attractions of the City and of London as a visitor destination remain strong.</u></p>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Policy CV4 - Evening and night-time economy: Paragraphs 5.3.11 – 5.3.12 and 5.3.15	<p>5.3.11 Night-time entertainment uses in the City include restaurants and cafes (A3), drinking establishments (A4), hot food takeaways (A5) and other related uses including, for example, a nightclub or a mix of such uses. They form part of the City’s wider night-time economy.</p> <p>5.3.12 The management of night-time entertainment and licensed premises is undertaken through the operation of both planning and licensing regimes. In general, the planning regime controls the location, design and planning use of premises to protect the amenity of an area or local residents, whilst the licensing regime is used, having regard to licensing objectives, to control specific activities at premises to prevent, for example, noise and other public nuisance. <u>Changes to the Use Classes Order in 2020 allow flexibility for</u></p>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

	<p><u>commercial premises including offices and shops to become restaurants and cafes without requiring planning permission. Licensing and environmental health legislation would need to be applied to address any potential nuisance to nearby occupiers in these circumstances, albeit that planning permission would be required for any physical works such as ventilation equipment associated with a restaurant or café use.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>5.3.15 All planning applications for <u>restaurants and cafes, where planning permission is required, and for drinking establishments, hot food takeaways A3, A4, A5</u> and related, uses should include information stating the proposed hours of operation. The City Corporation may impose conditions requiring the closure of the premises between the hours of 11pm and 7am where appropriate. such as near noise sensitive uses.</p>	
<p>Policy IN1 – Infrastructure Provision and Connection: Paragraphs 5.4.5 and 5.4.10</p>	<p>5.4.5. The dense concentration of businesses means that high demand is focused in a restricted geographical area. Electricity, telecommunications, water, gas and district heating and cooling networks are of particular importance. Congested cable routes traverse the City under its streets. Energy demands are increasing, particularly to provide air conditioning to counter increased warming and the delivery of upgraded ICT networks required by financial and business services. <u>The impact of Covid-19 has highlighted the importance of digital connectivity. Recovery from the pandemic offers an opportunity to speed up the transition to a digital economy, accelerating the adoption of remote and home working, e-learning, e-commerce and telemedicine.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>5.4.10. It is essential for the City to be digitally connected and responsive to the changing requirements of business, <u>equipping businesses to benefit from the digital transformation stimulated by the Covid-19 pandemic.</u> and for Buildings to <u>must</u> be equipped to meet the <u>digital</u> needs of current and future occupiers. Developers will be expected to undertake an assessment of the connectivity of major new office buildings or refurbishments, using a wired certification such as WiredScore.</p>	<p>To reflect the impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic and the London Recharged Report</p>

Design – context: Paragraph 6.1.3	6.1.3. To realise the City Corporation’s vision for the Square Mile, the design of the built environment should contribute towards the delivery of a competitive and creative City with exemplars of sustainable building design. Development should contribute towards the aim of achieving a zero emission and climate resilient City by 2050 2040 in accordance with the London Plan City Corporation’s Climate Action Strategy .	Factual update
Strategic Policy S8 – Design: Paragraph 6.1.8	6.1.8. The City has a large workforce whose numbers are expected to grow substantially, <u>albeit that increased remote working means that actual footfall may not rise in proportion to total employment.</u> Most journeys within the Square Mile are on foot and pedestrian movement is particularly high during morning and evening peak times. The City has retained much of its historic street pattern, which provides convenient walking routes and allows for a high degree of pedestrian permeability. The City Corporation uses pedestrian modelling to better understand pedestrian flows and to manage the impact of proposed new development. The Transport Strategy sets standards and targets for pedestrian accessibility which will be implemented, in part, through this Plan.	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Policy DE1 - Sustainability Standards: Paragraphs 6.1.11 and 6.1.14	6.1.11. The drivers for sustainable development are increasing, affecting global and local businesses, workers, residents and visitors. <u>The businesses that survive will be those that embrace sustainability and responsible consumption.</u> The pace and prestigious nature of development in the City presents opportunities to incorporate innovative design in both new and existing buildings to provide positive environmental outcomes for the City’s priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy, carbon emissions and air pollutants – reducing emissions and moving to a zero emission and zero carbon city by 2050 2040, in line with London Plan the requirements of the City Corporation’s Climate Action Strategy; • Water – reducing water use in an area of serious water stress; • Pollution – reducing exposure to poor air quality; • Materials – retaining embodied carbon in existing buildings and materials and improving resource efficiency. 	Factual updates to reflect the City Corporation’s Climate Action Strategy and the London Recharged Report

	<p>...</p> <p>6.1.14. The City Corporation is developing has adopted a Climate Action Strategy which will set sets out a trajectory towards zero carbon in the City of London by 2040, and actions required to ensure that the City is resilient to the impacts of climate change. The application of sustainability standards through this Plan will contribute to the achievement of these objectives. <u>Guidance in the area of sustainable development is rapidly evolving. Applicants should use the most up to date guidance to inform their planning proposals.</u></p>	
<p>Vehicular Transport and Servicing – context: New paragraph after paragraph 6.2.1</p>	<p>6.2.1. The City is served by an extensive public transport network with six mainline railway stations, 12 underground and DLR stations and an extensive network of bus routes. Transport for London identifies the whole of the City of London as having a Public Transport Accessibility rating of above 6, the highest possible score. In addition, major rail termini near the City are used by large numbers of City commuters. Significant improvements are being made to public transport provision, particularly with the opening of the Elizabeth Line with two stations in the City at Farringdon and Liverpool Street/Moorgate. There are also river bus services which stop at Blackfriars Pier and at Tower Pier just outside the City.</p> <p><u>6.2.x. The City has access to a very wide regional labour pool with many of its businesses drawing their workforces from destinations across London and the wider South East. The provision of safe, convenient, sustainable and effective public transport services and facilities is critical to the City’s international competitiveness and its ability to continue to attract highly skilled workers. Given the unique nature of the City, with its comparatively low residential population and its dependence on inward commuting, the widely publicised ‘15-minute cities’ concept is not directly relevant to the City’s circumstances. For instance, some services for City residents are provided in adjoining boroughs through partnership working arrangements, since it may not be cost effective to deliver those services within the Square Mile. The policies in this Plan seek to facilitate ease of access to jobs and services by walking and cycling for those who are able to do so, including ensuring good connections to neighbouring boroughs.</u></p>	<p>To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic</p>

Vehicular Transport and Servicing – context: Paragraph 6.2.4	6.2.4 The demands on the City’s transport network are increasing due to significant growth, fast-moving technological development and changing travel habits. In light of these factors, the City Corporation published a long-term Transport Strategy in 2019 which sets the key priorities for the City’s streets and how the network is used. The Transport Strategy was developed in parallel with the drafting of the Local Plan and the policies set out in both are aligned. <u>Measures to support the City’s Covid-19 recovery may provide an opportunity to accelerate delivery of some elements of the Transport Strategy.</u>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Active Travel and Healthy Streets – context: Paragraph 6.3.2	6.3.2 The City’s workforce is expected to increase significantly over the course of the Plan period to 2036, <u>albeit that increased remote working means that actual footfall is unlikely to rise in proportion to total employment.</u> while visitor numbers are also anticipated to rise. This will result in significant and increasing pressure on the pavements and the public realm at peak times in the morning, lunchtime and early evening. Figure 15 illustrates forecast pedestrian flows across the City in 2026 during the am peak. <u>This forecast was produced before the Covid-19 pandemic and it is uncertain to what extent the pandemic may affect medium and longer term pedestrian movement in the City. The pandemic has, however, emphasised the importance of facilitating safe and convenient public transport services into and out of the City together with measures to ensure active travel and pedestrian comfort within the City’s boundaries.</u>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Strategic Policy S14 - Open Spaces and Green Infrastructure: Paragraph 6.6.3	6.6.3. Open and green space is under increasing pressure due to the intensification of development, an expanding workforce and growing visitor numbers projected over the Plan period. <u>It is important that access to these spaces is protected and expanded as they provide multiple positive impacts on physical health and mental wellbeing, including providing opportunities for exercise, to reduce stress levels, and to facilitate social interaction.</u>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic
Policy OS2 - City Greening:	Policy OS2: City Greening	To reflect advice from the District Surveyor

Paragraph 6.6.13	<p>1. The provision of urban greening should be integral to the design and layout of buildings and the public realm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development proposals will be required to demonstrate the highest feasible levels of greening consistent with good design and the local context; • The installation of biodiverse extensive or intensive green roofs, terraces and green walls will be sought, <u>where appropriate</u>, and new development should not compromise these elements on existing buildings located nearby; and • The loss of green walls and roofs, in whole or in part, will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. <p>...</p> <p>6.6.13. The City of London Corporation has long championed green roofs and continues to actively encourage them, but other forms of greening are less common in and around new buildings. The City Corporation will seek the provision of trees and landscaping <u>in all development where this is possible, and vertical greening such as green walls will be sought on buildings which do not provide for overnight sleeping accommodation</u>. Green walls bring many of the same benefits to the environment as green roofs and can improve the appearance of locations where there is limited opportunity for horizontal planting. To be successful they require careful design, installation and regular maintenance.</p>	
Policy OS3 – Biodiversity: Paragraph 6.6.24	<p>6.6.24. The City has 13 Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs), including three new SINCs (Postman’s Park, Portsoken Street Garden, St Dunstan in the East Church Garden) which were designated <u>agreed</u> following a review in 2016. Two existing SINCs were <u>agreed to be</u> upgraded to Sites of Borough Importance for Nature Conservation (SBINC) as part of this review: Barbican and St Alphage Garden, which includes the Barbican Wildlife Garden and the Beech Gardens, <u>was upgraded from Grade 2 to Grade 1 Site of Borough Importance for Nature Conservation (SBINC)</u>; and Roman Wall, Noble Street, which was extended <u>southwards</u> to include St Anne and St Agnes Churchyard <u>and</u></p>	Factual clarification

	<u>was upgraded from a Local SINC to a Grade 2 SBINC. These new and upgraded SINC's will formally take effect upon adoption of this Plan.</u>	
Strategic Policy S15 - Climate Resilience and Flood Risk: Paragraphs 6.7.2 – 6.7.3 and 6.7.6	<p>6.7.2. The UK Climate Projections (CP18) predict that London will experience a rise in mean temperatures of between 2°C and 6°C by 2061. This will increase the risk of overheating and the need for energy intensive air conditioning. In addition to this the City can experience temperatures up to 10°C higher than the countryside around London, due to heat retention and waste heat expulsion from buildings resulting in an Urban Heat Island Effect. Climate change could potentially affect patterns of wind flow in high-density urban environments like the City and this will be kept under review. The City Corporation is developing <u>has adopted</u> a Climate Action Strategy setting out how the City can transition to a zero carbon economy <u>by 2040</u> and be resilient to the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>6.7.3. Today's new buildings will probably be in place for decades or longer and must be resilient to the weather patterns and climate conditions they will encounter during their lifetime. Designing climate resilience into buildings and the public realm will help keep the City safe and comfortable as climate patterns change. Policy DE1 (<u>Sustainability Standards</u>) sets out sustainability standards for new development in the City and the City Corporation's ambition to move to a zero emission City <u>by 2040. This includes scope 3 emissions and embodied carbon which can be addressed through whole life carbon assessment.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>6.7.6. The City Corporation will continue to monitor and model climate change impacts on the City to inform policy and decision making <u>through implementation of, and annual monitoring and review of, the City Corporation's Climate Action Strategy.</u> UK Climate Projections <u>and the detailed actions in the Climate Action Strategy</u> will form the basis of future planning for climate resilience in the City. The City of London Strategic Flood Risk</p>	Factual updates

	Assessment will be reviewed at least every five years or more frequently if circumstances require.	
Policy CR2 - Flood Risk: Paragraph 6.7.15	6.7.15. Within the City Flood Risk Area different uses will be acceptable in different zones. Table 4 shows the vulnerability classifications and Table 5 shows which level of vulnerability classification is suitable in which part of the City Flood Risk Area. The Environment Agency's flood zones are shown on the policies map. The Sequential Test must be applied for all development other than minor development or change of use in the City Flood Risk Area, which comprises Environment Agency Flood Zones 2 and 3 and areas at risk of surface water / sewer flooding. Where a change of use results in a more vulnerable use evidence must be presented to demonstrate safety and suitable access and egress routes. <u>Where necessary, conditions may be attached to planning permissions to manage the change of use into more vulnerable categories.</u>	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020
Strategic Policy S17 - Thames Policy Area: Paragraph 7.2.5	7.2.5 There are a range of different strategies and plans which affect the Thames including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The London Plan, which sets out strategic policies for the River Thames and requires the designation of a Thames Policy Area. • The Mayor of London's Safeguarded Wharves Review <u>2018-2019</u>, which started in 2018 and aims to ensure that London's need for waterborne freight-handling uses is met. • The Thames Estuary 2100 Plan produced by the Environment Agency, which addresses flood risk and water quality issues. • The Thames Vision produced by the Port of London Authority, which sets a framework for greater use of the River Thames between now and 2035 including targets for increased passenger and freight movements. 	Factual updates

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Guidance called A Safer Riverside produced by the Port of London Authority, which aims to reduce the number of people drowning in the Thames by ensuring that safety is an intrinsic part of all development alongside and on the tidal Thames.</u> <p>...</p>	
Strategic Policy S20 - Aldgate, Tower and Portsoken	<p>Strategic Policy S20: Aldgate, Tower and Portsoken</p> <p>The Aldgate, Tower and Portsoken Key Area of Change will be promoted as a mixed-use area, which balances the competing needs of residents, workers and visitors, by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promoting office-led commercial development to assist in the further renewal of the area. Diplomatic use and associated commercial activity will be encouraged. 2. <u>Supporting and enabling residential development in appropriate locations and</u> identifying and meeting residents' needs, utilising a range of funding sources to: <p>...</p>	To reflect advice from Planning Inspector during an advisory visit, in which he commented that this policy needs to refer to residential development to be consistent with the distribution of development set out in the Spatial Strategy
Strategic Policy S21 - City Cluster: Paragraph 7.6.2	<p>7.6.1. ...Recognisable and iconic tall buildings, including the Gherkin and the Leadenhall Building, have been constructed over the past 15 years and a number of significant tall buildings are under construction. Further tall buildings have been permitted but not yet commenced. Employment in the Cluster could increase from approximately 115,000 today, to over 200,000 once all current permissions are built out and occupied.</p> <p>7.6.2 <u>While increased remote working means that actual footfall may not rise in proportion to P</u>projected employment growth, <u>the planned intensification of development in a relatively small geographic area is expected to</u> will lead to a significant increase in footfall on streets that are already crowded at peak times. The City Cluster adjoins the Liverpool Street Key Area of Change and the opening of the Elizabeth Line will bring increased pedestrian movement into the Cluster, with Bishopsgate a key pedestrian</p>	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic

	<p>route into and through the area. This concentration of activity will require new approaches to freight and servicing, including the use of physical and virtual consolidation. To assist delivery of transformational projects in the Cluster, the City Corporation will support the work of the Eastern City Cluster Partnership in the process to become a Business Improvement District.</p>	
<p>Strategic Policy S22 - Fleet Street and Ludgate: Paragraph 7.7.11</p>	<p>Strategic Policy S22: Fleet Street and Ludgate</p> <p>The character and function of the Fleet Street and Ludgate_Key Area of Change as a centre for judicial and related business, a royal and state_processional route and a Principal Shopping Centre (PSC) will be promoted by:</p> <p>...</p> <p>6. Retaining retail provision within the Fleet Street PSC Principal Shopping Centre and Retail Link and encouraging extension of retail, leisure and cultural activity into the evening and weekends, whilst retaining a focus on <u>comparison and convenience shopping in the PSC.A1-uses</u>.</p> <p>...</p> <p>7.7.11. The PSC is an important aspect of Fleet Street that provides vibrancy along its length. To strengthen the PSC, it should continue to focus on <u>comparison and convenience shoppingA1-uses</u>, but also look to extend its retail offer into the evenings and weekends. The Retail Link on Ludgate Hill provides a key route between the Fleet Street and Cheapside PSCs and further retail development for <u>retail and town centre uses</u> is appropriate along this route.</p>	<p>To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020</p>
<p>Strategic Policy S22 - Fleet Street and Ludgate:</p>	<p>7.7.9. The Key Area of Change contains a mix of large modern office developments and smaller scale historic buildings on small plots more suitable for SME use. Several major occupiers have vacated office buildings on Fleet Street in recent years, providing</p>	<p>To reflect the importance of partnership working</p>

Paragraph 7.7.9	<p>opportunities for beneficial change though the City-wide presumption in favour of protecting office uses will continue to apply and the area's commercial office focus will remain. Heritage and views constraints may limit opportunities for significant increases in floorspace.</p> <p><i>[moved to new paragraph]</i></p> <p><u>7.7.xx</u> There may be potential for partnership working between occupiers in the area to deliver improvements and more flexible use of some buildings whilst retaining a predominance of commercial uses which complement the City's business focus. <u>To assist with the development of a coherent vision for the area, the City Corporation will support the work of the Fleet Street Quarter Partnership in the process to become a Business Improvement District. The Partnership is keen to explore ways in which Fleet Street can act as a vibrant spine for the area, while improving its links with other parts of the City including the area up to High Holborn and access to the riverside.</u></p>	
Strategic Policy S23 - Smithfield and Barbican	<p>Strategic Policy S23: Smithfield and Barbican</p> <p>The City Corporation will improve the Smithfield and Barbican area by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implementing the Culture Mile initiative, including delivering art and cultural attractions and public realm improvements through the Culture Mile Look and Feel Strategy. • ensuring the retention and improvement of pedestrian permeability and connectivity through large sites such as Smithfield Market, Golden Lane and Barbican whilst seeking to preserve privacy, security and noise abatement for residents and businesses; • ensuring future alternative uses that are appropriate to the listed status of the market buildings in Smithfield if the existing uses are relocated; 	To reflect advice from Planning Inspector during an advisory visit, in which he commented that this policy needs to refer to residential development to be consistent with the distribution of development set out in the Spatial Strategy.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>supporting and enabling residential development in appropriate locations;</u> • identifying and meeting residents' needs in the north of the City, including the protection and enhancement of residential amenity, community facilities and open space; 	
Strategic Policy S23 - Smithfield and Barbican and Strategic Policy S25 – Smithfield: Paragraphs 7.8.5, 7.8.16 & 7.8.18	<p>7.8.5 The City Corporation has taken a decision in principle, subject to feasibility and consultation, to consolidate <u>co-locate</u> its 3 wholesale markets to in a new location which could release the existing Smithfield Market buildings for alternative use. ...</p> <p>7.8.16 The City Corporation has taken a decision in principle to consolidate <u>co-locate</u> its three wholesale markets onto a single site and it is possible that Smithfield Market will relocate to this consolidated <u>new</u> wholesale market site during the Plan period. ...</p> <p>7.8.18 The City Corporation has carried out a strategic review of its 3 wholesale markets, Smithfield, Billingsgate and New Spitalfields. A decision has been taken in principle, subject to feasibility and consultation, to consolidate <u>co-locate</u> the wholesale markets onto a single site. If the decision in principle to consolidate <u>co-locate</u> the wholesale markets <u>on a new site</u> is confirmed, then a planning brief or Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared setting out further guidance on potential future uses for the Smithfield Market buildings.</p>	Factual updates
Implementation – monitoring: New paragraph after paragraph 8.2.3	8.2.3. The City Corporation is required to review the Local Plan at least every five years from the date of adoption to determine whether it needs to be updated. Data and trends identified in the Local Plan monitoring reports may indicate the need for an earlier partial or full review of the adopted Plan. The emergence of new trends resulting from the coronavirus <u>Covid-19</u> pandemic and its aftermath will be <u>regularly</u> monitored for their policy implications.	To reflect impacts arising from the Covid-19 pandemic / Factual update

	<p><u>8.2.4. As mentioned in the introduction to this Plan, the Government is pursuing a planning reform agenda which includes proposals to radically change the format and content of local plans. These reforms, if enacted, will be a key factor in determining the timing and scope of the next review of the City of London's Local Plan.</u></p>	
Glossary	<p>SINCs - Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation</p> <p><u>The Greater London Authority* designated SINCs to highlight areas of ecological value in the City. London's most valuable places for wildlife that provide local people with access to nature have been identified as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs).</u></p> <p>The sites are graded as being of Metropolitan, Borough or Local importance.</p>	Factual clarification
Glossary	<p>Social and community facilities</p> <p>Social and community facilities are defined by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and its subsequent amendments, <u>including the Town and Country Planning (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020. Order 1987 and its subsequent amendments.</u> The majority of social and community facilities fall within <u>Class E (Commercial, business and services), Class F.1 (Learning and non-residential institutions) and Class F.2 (Local community uses) C2 (Residential Institutions), D1 (Non-residential Institutions) and D2 (Assembly and Leisure)</u> use classes. Community facilities include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leisure and cultural facilities (including arts, entertainment and sport facilities) 2. Community centres and meeting places (including places of worship) 3. Libraries 4. Facilities for children (from nursery provision to youth clubs) 5. Education (including adult education) 6. Healthcare facilities 	To reflect changes to the Use Classes Order introduced in September 2020

Report – Standards Committee

Fixed Terms for Independent Persons

To be presented on Thursday, 14th January 2021

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

SUMMARY

The Committee on Standards in Public Life has recommended that Independent Persons are appointed for a fixed term of two years, renewable once. They also recommend that the terms of multiple Independent Persons should, ideally, overlap. Both the Standards Committee and the Establishment Committee have now considered the matter and are proposing to introduce a fixed term of two years, renewable twice. The Standards Committee has also agreed in principle to stagger the appointments of the Independent Persons. This Honourable Court is now therefore asked to endorse these proposals and the necessary transitional arrangements.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Court of Common Council endorse a fixed term of office of two years, renewable twice, for the City Corporation's Independent Persons, alongside the necessary transitional arrangements as set out in this report.

MAIN REPORT

Background

1. Under section 28 of the Localism Act 2011 the City Corporation must appoint at least one Independent Person whose views must be sought, and taken into account, before the Corporation makes its decision on an allegation that a Member has breached the Code of Conduct that it has decided to investigate. The City Corporation has decided to seek the views of an Independent Person at every stage of the complaints process and a Member complained about may also seek the views of an Independent Person at every stage. To avoid any issues of fairness and confidentiality arising from this dual role, the Corporation aims to have three Independent Persons in post at any one time.
2. The Independent Persons have an additional role in providing advice, views or recommendations on any disciplinary action to be taken against the Town Clerk (as head of paid service), the Comptroller & City Solicitor (as monitoring officer) and the Chamberlain (as chief finance officer). The appointment of the Independent Persons also therefore comes within the remit of the Establishment Committee and any recommendations subsequently need the approval of the Court of Common Council, as the appointing body.

3. The Committee on Standards in Public Life (“CSPL”) advises the Prime Minister on ethical standards across the whole of public life in England. The CSPL published its report on Local Government Ethical Standards in January 2019 and made a number of recommendations. One of these recommendations was that the Localism Act 2011 (which is silent about terms of office) should be amended to require that Independent Persons are appointed for a fixed term of two years, renewable once.
4. The findings of the CSPL review were initially reported to the Standards Committee on 3 May 2019, where it was agreed in principle that a fixed term of office should be introduced for the City Corporation’s Independent Persons, without waiting for any legislative change. As stated in the CSPL review, this was perceived to have benefits for both the Independent Persons and the City Corporation. However, Members expressed the view that the term proposed was potentially too short, and requested a further report outlining the advantages and disadvantages of introducing fixed terms of differing lengths. Additional papers were therefore subsequently presented to the Standards Committee at their meetings on 24 January 2020 and 2 October 2020 which has resulted in the present proposals before this Court today.

Fixed terms

5. The CSPL make the point that security of tenure is important in order to protect Independent Persons from being removed from their role for unpopular advice or recommendations. Equally, however, restricted tenure can ensure that the Independent Person’s judgment and independence is not compromised by a long period of involvement in a single authority. They therefore recommend a fixed term of two years, with the option of a single re-appointment. They also recommend that the terms of multiple Independent Persons should ideally overlap, to ensure a level of continuity and institutional memory.
6. The Standards Committee accepted that the CSPL recommendation would ensure a regular turnover of Independent Persons, with a constantly changing perspective and no opportunity for any bias, or apparent bias, towards the City Corporation or any of its Members to emerge. However, it was also felt that this could lead to a lack of continuity that might prove disruptive to the work of the Standards Committee. It was also noted that it has not always been easy to recruit Independent Persons with the necessary skills and experience to carry out the role effectively.
7. Both Members and Co-opted Members of the Standards Committee are currently able to serve for a maximum of eight years, and this is normally achieved through a four-year term, renewable once. There was some support for introducing equivalent arrangements for the City Corporation’s Independent Persons, which would provide a level of consistency, whilst still moving away from the undesirable situation of having open-ended appointments.
8. Comparisons were also drawn with the City Corporation’s Audit and Risk Management Committee, where appointments are for three years, and Co-opted Members can serve for up to nine years in total. Reference was also made to

the guidance that charity trustees should generally serve no more than nine years in office.

9. However, the Standards Committee were also mindful that, if the Government were to subsequently adopt the CSPL recommendation in full, then opting for any other option now would lead to further disruption in the future, as the terms of office of the Independent Persons would have to be adjusted again at that stage. It was ultimately considered that a two year term, renewable twice (up to six years in total) would therefore strike the best balance between independence and continuity, whilst providing the opportunity for regular reviews and minimising disruption in the event that the statutory provisions were subsequently changed.

Phased appointments

10. The City Corporation currently has four Independent Persons. Two of those are original appointments dating back to 21 June 2012. Two new appointments were made by the Court of Common Council on 16 July 2020, following the resignation of the third original appointee. This temporary increase in numbers represented an acknowledgement that the two incumbents had already served for an extended period of time and would likely be vacating their positions in the near future.
11. The Standards Committee expressed support for the terms of the Independent Persons being staggered, in order to spread recruitment and assist with continuity. Officers have subsequently spoken to the two recently appointed Independent Persons and it is proposed that one will serve an initial one year term, and up to five years in total, whilst the other will serve an initial two year term, and up to six years in total.
12. With the agreement of the Independent Persons, lots were drawn by the Town Clerk, and it is therefore proposed that Gary Rogers serve an initial term of two years and up to six years in total and that Amanda Orchard serve an initial term of one year and up to five years in total.
13. Officers have also spoken to the two longer serving Independent Persons and they are content to continue in post until the summer of 2021, when it is proposed that one new Independent Person will be appointed in their stead.

Governance review

14. Lord Lisvane's recently published review of corporate governance made wide-ranging recommendations in relation to the work of the Standards and Establishment Committees. Whatever arrangements are adopted in the future, one or more Independent Persons will still be required. In relation to his proposed Panel of Independent Persons, Lord Lisvane wrote that:

The terms of appointment will need to be staggered to avoid the need for substantial replacement of the Panel, and loss of embodied experience, at any one time. A base term of appointment might be four years, with reappointment for one further term.

15. The Standards Committee acknowledged that if Lord Lisvane's review led to the Court introducing standard terms across the board for all external appointees then the terms of the Independent Persons may need to be revisited in order to comply with that. However, it was felt that Members needed to take a view on this specific issue now, based on all of the information currently available.

Conclusion

16. The Standards Committee is proposing to introduce fixed terms of office for the City Corporation's Independent Persons and to stagger their appointments. As two of the incumbents have been in post for more than eight years it has now become pressing for Members to make a decision on an appropriate length for those terms and the necessary transitional arrangements. The Establishment Committee subsequently endorsed these proposals which we now also recommend to the Court of Common Council for adoption.

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

DATED this 2nd day of October 2020.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Caroline Addy
Chairman of the Standards Committee

Report – Hospitality Working Party of the Policy and Resources Committee

Applications for Hospitality

To be presented on Thursday, 14th January 2021

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

(a) Armed Forces Flag Day 2021

Armed Forces Flag Day forms part of a week of activities across the country to raise public awareness of the contribution made by the Armed Forces. Armed Forces Flag Day was established to provide an opportunity to show support to members of the Armed Forces and Service families.

To mark this occasion, it is proposed that the City Corporation hosts a flag-raising ceremony in Guildhall Yard during the afternoon of Thursday 24th June 2021, followed by light refreshments in the Old Library.

The event will provide an opportunity for the City to show its support for the Armed Forces, acknowledge the challenges encountered in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and raise awareness of the contribution made by those who are currently serving or have previously served in the Forces.

Guests will include serving and retired military personnel, reservists, cadets, Masters and Clerks of Livery Companies, pupils from the City's schools and academies and representatives from the City's 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 a flag-raising ceremony to mark Armed Forces Flag Day, followed by light refreshments, and that arrangements are made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash and within approved parameters.

(b) Commonwealth High Commissioners' Banquet 2021

The City Corporation has hosted an annual banquet for the Commonwealth High Commissioners since 2015.

The Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) was scheduled to take place in Rwanda in June of this year, and the High Commissioners' Banquet was planned for September, but owing to the Covid-19 pandemic, CHOGM and the Banquet had to be deferred. It is now anticipated that CHOGM will take place in June 2021, subject to any public health restrictions that might be in operation at the time.

It is proposed that the City Corporation hosts the High Commissioners' Banquet at Guildhall on Monday 13th September 2021, working with the Royal Commonwealth Society and Commonwealth Enterprise and Investment Council. Guests would include High Commissioners, nominations from the Royal Commonwealth Society and Commonwealth Enterprise and Investment Council, representatives from businesses with Commonwealth interests, national and international environmental and sustainability industries, green finance, leading national political figures and other relevant institutional representatives.

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 strengthen local, regional, national and international relationships to secure new opportunities for business collaboration and innovation (outcome 7b); to preserve and promote the City as the world-leading global centre for financial and professional services, commerce and culture (outcome 7c); and to influence UK and global policy and regulation and international agreements to protect the environment (outcome 11d).

It is **recommended** that hospitality be granted for a banquet for the Commonwealth High Commissioners and that arrangements are made under the auspices of the Policy and Resources Committee; the costs to be met from City's Cash within agreed parameters.

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

DATED this of 21st Day of December 2020

SIGNED on behalf of the Working Party.

Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney
Chief Commoner and Chairman, Hospitality Working Party



List of Applications for the Freedom

To be presented on Thursday, 14th January, 2021

*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.

Syed Ali Abbas <i>Ald. & Sheriff Prof. Michael Raymond Mainelli</i> <i>Ald. Alastair John Naisbitt King</i>	an Iman <i>Citizen and World Trader</i> <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Streatham, London
Md Shahidul Alam <i>Oliver Sells, QC, CC</i> <i>Graeme Martyn Doshi-Smith, CC</i>	a Cricket Development Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Musician</i> <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i>	Stratford, London
Tudor Victor Leopold Porchester Baron <i>Thomas Sleigh, Deputy</i> <i>Ald. & Sheriff Prof. Michael Raymond Mainelli</i>	a Healthcare Service Manager <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i> <i>Citizen and World Trader</i>	Finsbury Park, London
Benjamin Alan Brooker <i>Ian Brooker</i> <i>Michael John Goddard</i>	a Musician <i>Citizen and Upholder</i> <i>Citizen and Upholder</i>	Rochester, Kent
Nicola Jane Bunce <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Willow Sculptress <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Amersham, Buckinghamshire
Daniel Nicholas Cohen <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Timothy Levene, CC</i>	a Media Executive <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Primrose Hill, London
Michelle Jayne Dite <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>John Dominic Reid</i>	an Operations Director <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Balham, London
Nicholas Henry Fothergill <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Company Chairman <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Leicestershire
Eileen Margaret Fraser <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Dr. David Jefferys</i>	a Genealogist, retired <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Apothecary</i>	Radlett, Hertfordshire

Neil Anthony Fraser <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Dr. David Jefferys</i>	a Genealogist and Probate Researcher <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Apothecary</i>	Twickenham, Middlesex
Tao Geoghegan Hart <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	an Athlete <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Solder, Andorra
Philip Stephen Gregory <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Robert James Ingham Clark, Deputy</i>	a Chartered Accountant <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Watford, Hertfordshire
Margaret Ejodamen James-Cooper <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Political Journalist, retired <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Woodford Bridge, Essex
Fon Lim <i>Frederick Joseph Trowman</i> <i>David Robert Boston</i>	a Production Businessman <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	Singapore
Amy Victoria Rose Marren <i>Iain Reid</i> <i>Edward Gradosielski, BEM</i>	an Apprentice Solicitor <i>Citizen and Educator</i> <i>Citizen and Wax Chandler</i>	Hornchurch, Essex
Georgia Alexandra Rose Marren <i>Iain Reid</i> <i>Edward Gradosiezski, BEM</i>	a Business Administration Apprentice <i>Citizen and Educator</i> <i>Citizen and Wax Chandler</i>	Hornchurch, Essex
Sarah Louise Melvin <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Fund Management Executive <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Richmond, Surrey
Fernando Bras Messias <i>John Hartley Bowman</i> <i>Alan Robert Brumwell</i>	a Lawyer <i>Citizen and Stationer & Newspaper Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Plumber</i>	Faro, Portugal
Cameron Jay Rains <i>Ald. Vincent Keaveny</i> <i>David Fergus McDonough, OBE</i>	a Law Firm Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and Merchant Taylor</i>	La Mesa, California, United States of America
Dame Benita Margaret Rayne <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Trustee <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Kensington
Brian Anthony Sarre <i>Alfred Bain</i> <i>Mr Michael McAllister Todd</i>	a Community Centre Manager <i>Citizen and Turner</i> <i>Citizen and Turner</i>	St Peter Port, Guernsey
Richard Ross Smith, CBE <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>John Dominic Reid</i>	a Military Charity Senior Executive <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Haselbech, Northamptonshire

Michael Patrick Joseph Vaughan

Raymond Hollands

Donald Howard Coombe, MBE

a City of London Police
Constable, retired

Citizen and Poulter

Citizen and Poulter

Lowestoft, Suffolk

Simon David Warshaw

The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor

Jonathan Michael Arundell Bewes

a Banker

Citizen and Fan Maker

Ladbroke Grove, London

Susan Mary Williams

Ann-Marie Jefferys

Anne Elizabeth Holden

a Matron, retired

Citizen and Glover

Citizen and Basketmaker

Hook Norton, Oxfordshire

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – Policy & Resources Committee and Finance Committee

Report of Urgent Action Taken: Update to the Code of Corporate Governance concerning delegation of write-off limits and discretionary Business Rates relief

To be presented on Thursday, 14th January 2021

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

SUMMARY OF ACTION TAKEN

1. Earlier this year, in an effort to streamline and accelerate the decision-making process as part of the Corporation's response to the Covid-19 pandemic, amendments were made to the Scheme of Delegations affecting irrecoverable debt write-off limits. The Head of Revenues was given delegation to write-off debts of up to £100,000, and the Chamberlain was given delegation to write-off debts of up to £500,000 (the pre-Covid delegated limit was £20,000). Debts over £500,000 still require approval by your Finance Committee. These temporary measures expired on 31st October 2020.
2. At the same time, the limits of delegation were increased for the Head of Revenues from £5,000 to £25,000 for awards of discretionary rate relief, made under Sections 47 and 49 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988. This was also a temporary measure which expired on 31st October 2020.
3. Whilst the temporary write-offs and discretionary rate relief limits expired in October, the reason for the increased delegation limits continues, with many businesses and individuals likely to suffer further financial difficulties as a result of the pandemic.
4. The approval of the Court was, therefore, sought under urgency procedures, to extend the delegations for these revised limits until 31st March 2021. Whereupon a Report will be submitted to Members providing options on next steps.
5. A new grant scheme was also announced by the Government in the autumn, which involved regular support grant payments to businesses that have been forced to suspend trading due to the Covid restrictions. As this was a new scheme, there had been no previous requirement for delegation, and, therefore, Court was also asked to delegate authority for the payment of these business support grants to the Head of Revenues.

6. Approval was, therefore, granted by the Court of Common Council, under urgency procedures, to the following:

- The extension (to 31st March 2021) to the following amendments to the Scheme of Delegations to Officers:
 - To increase (temporarily) the limits to write-offs of debts due to the City of London Corporation which are irrecoverable up to £100,000 (Head of Revenues) and up to £500,000 (Chamberlain), with any amount in excess of £500,000 to be submitted to Finance Committee for approval. To note, Finance Committee will receive a Report for information on any write-offs over £25,000, and, a Report will be submitted to relevant Committees in March 2021 (as the temporary limits come to an end) providing options on next steps.
 - To authorise (temporarily) to the Head of Revenues, the granting of discretionary rate relief under Section 47 and Section 49 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988, of up to £25,000 per annum.
 - To delegate authority to the Head of Revenues to determine and award all business grant payments under the government support schemes.

RECOMMENDATION

7. We **recommend** that the actions taken under urgency procedures be noted.

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

DATED this 26th day of November 2020.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committees.

Jeremy Paul Mayhew
Chairman, Finance Committee

Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Chair, Policy & Resources Committee

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 14th January 2021

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

Bills

Date in force

European Union (Future Relationship) Act

30th December
2020

The Bill was introduced and received Royal Assent prior to the meeting of this Court. It implements and makes provision in connection with the Trade and Cooperation Agreement (TCA) and other Agreements with the EU. It received Royal Assent on 30th December after Parliamentary proceedings were completed within one day, in order to pass the Act before the end of the post-Brexit transition period on 31st December. The Act makes provision in connection with the UK's future relationship with the EU and its member States, enabling the implementation of arrangements and agreements that are either foreseen in the current Agreements, or which are agreed by the UK and EU to be 'supplementary' to the TCA. The Bill also creates powers to make secondary legislation, where appropriate, to enable the Agreements to be implemented domestically or for domestic law to be interpreted in light of the Agreements.

Statutory Instruments

The Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (Code of Practice) Order 2020 No. 1330

31st December
2020

This Order brings the revised code of practice ("the Code") into operation, replacing the one which was brought into operation by a previous Order of 2015, in accordance with the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996. The Code sets out the manner in which police officers are to record, retain and reveal to the prosecutor material obtained in the course of a criminal investigation and which may be relevant to the investigation. The revisions introduced by the Code implement recommendations of the Attorney General's Review of the efficiency and effectiveness of disclosure in the criminal justice system, published in November 2018. Copies of the Code and the Explanatory Memorandum may be obtained from the Remembrancer's Office.

The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (All Tiers) (England) Regulations 2020 No. 1374

2nd December
2020

These Regulations impose restrictions on gatherings and on businesses in England, including restricted hours for certain businesses and closure of certain businesses, according to a three-Tier system. The Regulations listed “the area” of “The Common Council, in respect of the City of London” as a Tier 2 area, but this designation has been varied by the subsequent amending regulations made on 16th and 20th December as noted below. The need for the restrictions in these Regulations must be reviewed by the Secretary of State every 28 days.

The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (Local Authority Enforcement Powers and Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020 No. 1375

2nd December
2020

These Regulations enable local authority officers designated for the purposes of the Regulations, to issue notices to people who are contravening or have contravened various statutory provisions in place to minimise exposure to Coronavirus. They provide that it is an offence, punishable on summary conviction by a fine, to contravene a notice under these Regulations without reasonable excuse, and that prosecutions of such an offence may be brought by a local authority, the Crown Prosecution Service and any person designated by the Secretary of State. Further, a local authority designated officer may issue a fixed penalty notice to a person the officer reasonably believes has committed such an offence. The Regulations define “designated” as designated by name or description, and provide that a person designated by a local authority or the Secretary of State for the purposes of certain provisions in other Coronavirus Regulations is to be treated as if they were so designated for the purposes of various provisions within these Regulations.

The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (All Tiers) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No. 1533

16th December
2020

These Regulations remove from the list of Tier 2 areas and insert into the list of Tier 3 areas, “the area” of “The Common Council, in respect of the City of London”. They have been further amended by the following Regulations, by which the City of London is designated as a Tier 4 area.

The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (All Tiers and Obligations of Undertakings) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 No. 1611

20th December
2020

These Regulations create a further Tier of restrictions, Tier 4. They remove from the list of Tier 3 areas and insert into the list of Tier 4 areas, “the area” of “The Common Council, in respect of the City of London”.

The Clean Air Zones Central Services (Fees) (England) Regulations 2020 No. 1444

31st December
2020

“Charging authorities” with responsibility for traffic have the power to make charging schemes under the Transport Act 2000. Charging schemes allow, for example, motorists to be charged for travelling in the area for which the charging authority is responsible. The Secretary of State has the power to direct charging authorities to introduce charging schemes under the Environment Act 1995. These Regulations apply to charging authorities which have made charging schemes under an extant direction of the Secretary of State given for the purpose of reducing nitrogen dioxide levels. Under the 2000 Act, a charging scheme may be made jointly by one or more non-metropolitan local traffic authorities and one or more London traffic authorities. Under these Regulations, the Secretary of State will provide services known as the “clean air zones central services” which charging authorities may choose to use. These include a website which will allow motorists to check whether they need to pay a charge under a charging scheme and, if so, make the payments. Where charging authorities use the “clean air zones central services”, these Regulations impose a fee of £2 per charge paid for by a payment processed through the services and makes provision for its collection.

The Business Tenancies (Protection from Forfeiture: Relevant Period) (Coronavirus) (England) (No. 3) Regulations 2020 No. 1472

30th December
2020

Section 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. The Act defined “relevant period” as expiring on 30th of June 2020. This was extended by Regulations to 30th September and subsequently further extended to 31st December 2020. These Regulations extend the relevant period to 31st March 2021.

The Corporate Insolvency and Governance Act 2020 (Coronavirus) (Extension of the Relevant Period) (No. 2) Regulations 2020 No. 1483

31st December
2020

The Corporate Insolvency and Governance Act 2020 introduced temporary provisions restricting the filing of petitions to wind up companies. The period within which the temporary provisions have effect was extended by Regulations to the 31st December 2020. These Regulations extend the period until 31st March 2021.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

Congratulatory Resolutions – *by Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney*

To be presented on Thursday, 14th January 2021

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

Motion:-

“That, following the reference to a number of Members and Officers of the City Corporation and City of London Police in the New Year’s Honours List and the delayed Birthday Honour’s List, the sincere congratulations of this Court be offered to:-

(i) **Jeremy Lewis Simons, OBE**, on his recent appointment by Her Majesty the Queen as an Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, in recognition of his services to environmental conservation in London.

(ii) **John Michael Petrie, OBE**, on his recent appointment by Her Majesty the Queen as an Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, in recognition of his services to Antigua and Barbuda.

(iii) **Douglas Gordon Fleming Barrow, MBE**, on his recent appointment by Her Majesty the Queen as a Member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, in recognition of his services to the maritime sector and to the City of London.

(iv) **Shravan Jashvantraï Joshi, MBE**, on his recent appointment by Her Majesty the Queen as a Member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, in recognition of his services to diversity and the British Hindu community.

(v) **Sufina Ahmad, MBE**, until recently Corporate Strategy Manager at the City Corporation, on her recent appointment by Her Majesty the Queen as a Member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, in recognition of her contributions to charitable service.

(vi) **Joanne Folan, QPM**, until her recent retirement a Detective Constable with the City of London Police, on her award by Her Majesty the Queen of the Queen’s Police Medal.

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank