

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, at **GUILDHALL**, on
THURSDAY next, the 7th day of October, 2021.

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

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n4IERB0i8EM&feature=youtu.be>

JOHN BARRADELL,
Town Clerk & Chief Executive.

*Guildhall,
Wednesday 29th September 2021*

Sir Peter Estlin

Robert Picton Seymour Howard

}

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 9 September 2021.

For Decision
(Pages 5 - 16)

4 **Mayoral Engagements**

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

5 **Election of Chief Commoner**

To elect a Chief Commoner for 2022/23.

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

- Simon D'Olier Duckworth, O.B.E., D.L.
- Ann Holmes

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

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

For Decision
(Pages 17 - 18)

6 **Policy Statement**

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

For Information

7 **Statues Working Group**

To consider recommendations relating to the statues of William Beckford and Sir John Cass, located in the Guildhall.

For Decision
(Pages 19 - 32)

8 **Policy and Resources Committee and Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee**

To consider proposals relating to a strategic review of the City's attractiveness as a destination for workers, residents and visitors.

For Decision
(Pages 33 - 40)

9 **Bridge House Estates Board**

To consider proposals relating to an uplift in the Bridge House Estate's Central Contingency budget.

For Decision
(Pages 41 - 44)

10 **Motions*****By Mark Raymond Peter Henry Delano Wheatley***

To consider a Motion, submitted by Mark Wheatley, in relation to a review of the City Corporation's procurement activities in the context of its Environmental, Social & Governance Strategy.

For Decision
(Pages 45 - 46)

11 **Questions**12 **The Freedom of the City**

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

For Decision
(Pages 47 - 50)

13 **Letter**

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

For Information

14 **Draft Vote of Thanks to the Lord Mayor**

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

For Information

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 51 - 52)

16 **Docquets for the Hospital Seal.**17 **Awards and Prizes**18 **Resolutions on Retirements, Congratulatory Resolutions, Memorials****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 2 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

For Decision

20 **Policy and Resources Committee**

To consider proposals relating to the Markets Co-location Programme

For Decision
(Pages 53 - 112)

21 **Finance Committee**

To consider the annual pay award for Museum of London staff.

For Decision
(Pages 113 - 116)

22 **City of London Police Authority Board and Establishment Committee**

To consider the creation of a Grade I post.

For Decision
(Pages 117 - 120)



RUSSELL, MAYOR

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

9th September 2021
MEMBERS PRESENT

ALDERMEN

Sir Charles Edward Beck Bowman
Professor Emma Edhem
Sir Peter Estlin
John Garbutt

Alison Gowman
Prem Goyal
Timothy Russell Hailes
Vincent Thomas Keaveny

Ian David Luder
Sheriff Professor Michael Raymond Mainelli
The Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor, William Anthony
Bowater Russell

COMMONERS

Deputy John David Absalom
Munsur Ali
Rehana Banu Ameer
Randall Keith Anderson
Douglas Barrow
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
John Douglas Chapman
Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst
Karina Dostalova

Simon D'Olier Duckworth
Deputy Peter Gerard Dunphy
Mary Durcan
John Ernest Edwards
Anne Helen Fairweather
Helen Lesley Fentimen
Marianne Bernadette Fredericks
Caroline Wilma Haines
Graeme Harrower
Sheriff Christopher Michael
Hayward
Deputy Tom Hoffman
Ann Holmes
Michael Hudson
Deputy Wendy Hyde
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark

Deputy Clare James
Shravan Joshi
Angus Knowles-Cutler
Gregory Alfred Lawrence
Tim Levene
Vivienne Littlechild
Oliver Arthur Wynlayne Lodge
Deputy Edward Lord
Andrew Paul Mayer
Jeremy Mayhew
Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Andrew Stratton McMurtrie
Wendy Mead
Deputy Robert Allan Merrett
Deputy Brian Desmond Francis
Mooney

Deputy Alastair Michael Moss
Deputy Barbara Patricia Newman
Graham Packham
Dhruv Patel
Judith Pleasance
Deputy James Henry George
Pollard
James de Sausmarez
Deputy John George Stewart Scott
Ian Christopher Norman Seaton
Jeremy Lewis Simons
Deputy James Michael Douglas
Thomson
James Richard Tumbridge
Deputy Philip Woodhouse
Dawn Linsey Wright

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| Minute's Silence | In view of the imminent 20th anniversary of the tragic events of 9/11, the Court proceeded to pause for a moment's silence and reflection, in order to pay tribute to those killed, injured, or otherwise affected. |
| 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 | <i>Resolved</i> – That the Minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded. |
| 4. Mayoral Engagements | The Right Honourable the Lord Mayor took the opportunity to update the Court on his recent engagement programme. |
| 5. Policy | The Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee provided the Court with an |

Statement

update touching on the recovery and re-opening of the City post-Co, the Corporation's response to the crisis in Afghanistan, and the recent Extinction Rebellion protests.

6. CITY OF LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD

(Deputy James Michael Douglas Thomson)

17 July 2021

External Member Appointment

The constitution of the City of London Police Authority Board allows for the recruitment of four external individuals (i.e. not Members of the Common Council) to the Board, through an open process. Two of these were new posts created in April 2021.

In July 2021, a selection panel recommended one candidate for appointment to a vacant position – Sir Craig Mackey.

Following the unanimous support of Members of the City of London Police Authority Board, the Court's approval was now sought for the appointment of external member, Sir Craig Mackey, to the City of London Police Authority Board for a four-year term commencing 9 September 2021.

Resolved – That Sir Craig Mackey be appointed to the City of London Police Authority Board for a four-year term, commencing 9 September 2021.

7. BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES BOARD

(Deputy Dr Giles Robert Evelyn Shilson)

17 July 2021

Protocol for Co-option to the Bridge House Estates Board and Sub-Committees

In support of the Bridge House Estates Board in its effective administration and governance of Bridge House Estates (Charity Reg. No. 1035628), the Court was asked to consider the adoption of a Protocol for Co-option of External Members to the Board and its sub-committees, reflecting best practice in the charity sector and also the City Corporation's ambitions to draw upon wider external skills, experience and knowledge, and to increase diversity and inclusion.

Resolved – That, it being considered to be in the best interests of the Bridge House Estates (Charity No. 1035628), the Court:

1. Approves the protocol for Co-option of External Members to the Bridge House Estates Board and its Sub-committees; and
2. In approving the Co-option Protocol, agrees to waive the requirements of the protocol on a one-time basis in order to allow the two previous external members of the City Bridge Trust Committee to be appointed to the Grants Committee of the Bridge House Estates Board until the next civic year.

8. **HOSPITALITY WORKING PARTY OF THE POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

(Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney, Chief Commoner)

19 July 2021

Applications for Hospitality

(a) Early evening reception to mark the 50th Anniversary of Bangladesh Independence and to celebrate the contribution of the Bangladeshi community to London

It was proposed that the City Corporation host an early evening reception on Thursday, 16 December 2021 to mark the 50th anniversary of Bangladesh independence and to celebrate the contribution of the Bangladeshi community to London and to the City.

London's large Bangladeshi community had made a significant contribution to the UK in many areas including commerce, politics, art, culture and food. 2021 was the 50th anniversary of Bangladesh's independence and, to mark the occasion, it was proposed the City Corporation host a reception on Tower Bridge. The event would provide an opportunity to celebrate the contribution of the Bangladeshi community to London and the UK and to exemplify the City Corporation's commitment to promoting a diverse and inclusive society.

It was, therefore, recommended that hospitality be granted and that arrangements are made under the auspices of the Policy and Resources Committee; the costs to be met from City's Cash within the agreed parameters.

Resolved – That hospitality be granted and that arrangements are made under the auspices of the Policy and Resources Committee; the costs to be met from City's Cash within the agreed parameters.

(b) Early evening reception to celebrate Diwali

It was proposed the City Corporation host an early evening reception in the Old Library on Wednesday 10 November 2021 to celebrate Diwali.

The City Corporation had, for a number of years, hosted an event to mark Diwali and this year intended an early evening reception, together with small dinners focusing on cultural themes and Green Finance. The events would provide an opportunity to demonstrate the City Corporation's commitment to bringing together different communities and celebrating London as a multi-faith city.

It was, therefore, recommended that hospitality be granted and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash within the agreed parameters.

Resolved – That hospitality be granted and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash within the agreed parameters.

(c) International Counter Terrorism and Intelligence Conference Dinner

It was proposed the City Corporation host a dinner for the 2022 International Counter Terrorism Conference on Monday 16 May 2022.

Counter Terrorism UK, the Metropolitan Police and City of London Police were to host a conference on counter terrorism in London from 16 - 18 May 2022. The annual conference was organised by the Leadership in Counter Terrorism Association and this would be the first time it had taken place in the United Kingdom. It was proposed the City Corporation host a dinner on the first night of the conference for the leading participants, which would provide an opportunity to promote the City Corporation and City of London Police in being at the forefront of counter terrorism initiatives internationally and demonstrate their commitment to support global counter terrorism initiatives and sharing best practice among security professions.

It was, therefore, recommended that hospitality be granted and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Police Authority Board; the costs to be met from City's Cash within the agreed parameters.

Resolved – That hospitality be granted and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Police Authority Board; the costs to be met from City's Cash within the agreed parameters.

(d) Early evening reception following a seminar on Civil Justice

It was proposed the City Corporation host an early evening reception following a seminar to be delivered in partnership with the Bingham Centre and the Magna Carta Trust on '*Build Back Better: Online Civil Justice after the Pandemic*' in the Livery Hall on 20 October 2021.

Regulatory confidence founded on the rule of law was a crucial foundation for the services provided by the City and generally in maintaining the UK's reputation as a place to do business. The City Corporation had worked with the Bingham Centre for the Rule of Law to promote the UK as being, from the Magna Carta onwards, the home of the rule of law. A seminar was to be held, to be delivered in partnership with the Bingham Centre and Magna Carta Trust, which would examine the acceleration of legal innovation in online civil justice and consider its future after the pandemic. It was proposed that the City Corporation hosts an early evening reception following the seminar and a small dinner, which would provide an opportunity to promote the City Corporation's commitment to the rule of law and access to justice.

It was, therefore, recommended that hospitality be granted and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Policy and Resources Committee; the costs to be met from City's Cash within the agreed parameters.

Resolved – That hospitality be granted and that arrangements are made under the auspices of the Policy and Resources Committee; the costs to be met from City's Cash within the agreed parameters.

(e) Report of Urgent Action Taken: Dinner for the Global Investment Summit 2021 at Guildhall on Monday 18 October 2021

The UK Government was hosting a Global Investment Summit in October 2021. Hosted by the Prime Minister and supported by Members of the Royal Family, the summit was intended to galvanize foreign investment in the UK's Green industries ahead of COP26 in November. The one-day meeting would attract senior level representation from the world's leading businesses and investors and showcase the UK's clean technologies and innovative companies.

The City Corporation had received a proposal to host a dinner preceding the Summit. This would provide an opportunity to demonstrate the City Corporation's leading role in promoting inward green investment to London and the UK, and promote the ongoing activity surrounding the build up to COP26. It would also provide a platform to strengthen the City Corporation's regional programme as the Summit would aim to drive investment to all parts of the UK in line with the recently announced Trade and Investment Hubs.

An urgent decision was sought and obtained for the award of hospitality, pursuant to Standing Order No.19, to allow arrangements to be progressed immediately and ensure invitations were sent out with as much notice as possible to secure the required high-level attendance.

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

9. Freedoms

The Chamberlain, in pursuance of the Order of this Court, presented a list of the under-mentioned, persons who had made applications to be admitted to the Freedom of the City by Redemption: -

Patricia Ann Babbitt	a Telecommunications Manager	Haverhill, Massachusetts, United States of America
<i>John A Welch</i>	<i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	
<i>Robert Andrews</i>	<i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	
Wesley Wilde Babbitt	a Ship's Captain	Haverhill, Massachusetts, United States of America
<i>John A Welch</i>	<i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	
<i>Robert Andrews</i>	<i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	
Elsa Christina Margareta Bjorling	a Medical Doctor	City of London
<i>Gregory James Kirby</i>	<i>Citizen and Glover</i>	
<i>Peter John Lambert</i>	<i>Citizen and Pavior</i>	
Peter Ignatius Bruemmer	a Real Estate Title Examiner	Perkasie, Pennsylvania, United States of America
<i>John A Welch</i>	<i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	
<i>Robert Andrews</i>	<i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	
Neil John Alexander	an Advertising and Exhibitions	Tonbridge, Kent

Buckley <i>Jeremy Christopher Charles Cross</i> <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i>	Company Director <i>Citizen and Insurer</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	
Harrison Helford Butler <i>Gerald Michael Edwards</i> <i>Martin Victor Edwards</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Fruiterer</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Sutton Courtenay, Oxfordshire
Ahmed Us Samad Chowdhury <i>Munsur Ali, CC</i> <i>Rehana Banu Ameer, CC</i>	a Television Company Chairman <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	Chigwell, Essex
Sylvia Pearl Cristofori <i>Deputy Charles Edward Lord, OBE, JP</i> <i>Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP</i>	an Administration Officer <i>Citizen and Broderer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Chafford Hundred, Essex
Professor Sir Partha Sarathi Dasgupta <i>Ald. Alison Jane Gowman</i> <i>Dominic Gerard Christian</i>	a University Professor Emeritus <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Insurer</i>	Cambridge, Cambridgeshire
Lee Harry Peter Dorman <i>Scott Marcus Longman</i> <i>John Francis Purnell</i>	a Security Consultant <i>Citizen and Educator</i> <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	Harlow, Essex
Albert George Doyle <i>Brian Martin Jones</i> <i>Gerald Michael Edwards</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and Fruiterer</i>	Kensington, London
Gary Dunne <i>Ald. Vincent Keaveny</i> <i>Vincent Dignam</i>	a Cultural Director & Musician <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Dublin, Ireland
Mohammed El Hussein <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Ald. Sir Charles Edward Beck Bowman</i>	a Technology Investment Company Director <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Chelsea, London
John Philip Glen, MP <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Deputy Catherine Sidony McGuinness</i>	a Member of Parliament <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Salisbury, Wiltshire
James Scott Goolnik <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sir Michael Snyder, Kt.</i>	a Dental Surgeon <i>Citizen and Needlemaker</i>	Wimbledon, London
Georgina Rose Longworth Hansen <i>Gerald Michael Edwards</i> <i>Martin Victor Edwards</i>	a Strategy Consultant <i>Citizen and Fruiterer</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	South Kensington, London
Maeve Francis Heath <i>Ald. Vincent Keaveny</i> <i>Vincent Dignam</i>	an Administrator <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Camden Town, London

Michael Thomas Limongello <i>John A Welch</i> <i>Robert Andrews</i>	a Business Development Consultant <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	Alpharetta, Georgia, United States of America
Sir Cameron Anthony Mackintosh <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>John Alfred Bennett, MBE</i>	a Theatre Producer <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Wincanton, Somerset
Joana Agyeiwaa Marfoh <i>Deputy Andrien Meyers</i> <i>Prem Babu Goyal, OBE, ALD.</i>	a Chartered Accountant <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i> <i>Citizen and Plumber</i>	Thornton Heath, Surrey
Sean Dermot O'Leary <i>Ald. Vincent Keaveny</i> <i>Vincent Dignam</i>	a Tv and Radio Presenter <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Primrose Hill, London
Frederick Earle Francis Price, MBE <i>Gregory James Kirby</i> <i>David Arnold Raines</i>	a Royal Navy Officer, retired <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Distiller</i>	Ottery St Mary, Devon
Sheikh Aliur Rahman <i>Munsur Ali, CC</i> <i>Thomas Sleigh, Deputy</i>	a Tea Merchant <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	Bethnal Green, London
John Vincent Romeo <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Deputy Catherine Sidony McGuinness</i>	a Management Consultant <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Holland Park, London
Edward Christopher Sheeran, MBE <i>Ald. Vincent Keaveny</i> <i>Vincent Dignam</i>	a Musician <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Framlingham, Suffolk
Charles Henry Buys Stevenson <i>Mark Raymond Peter Wheatley, CC</i> <i>James Henry George Pollard, Deputy</i>	a Sales General Manager <i>Citizen and Draper</i> <i>Citizen and Skinner</i>	Blackheath, London
Devam Sukhija <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	an Insurer <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Epsom, Surrey
Katy Thompson <i>David Anthony Barrett</i> <i>Robert Exton Dalrymple</i>	a Catering and Hospitality Company Director <i>Citizen and Coachmaker & Coach Harness Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Plaisterer</i>	Shenfield, Essex
Kirsten Alexandra Watkins <i>Keith Ian Low</i> <i>Yasmeen Stratton</i>	a Police Detective, retired <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i> <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	Brentwood, Essex

Read.

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

10.
Appointments

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

- (A) One Member on the Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2022.

Nominations received:-

Matthew Bell

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Matthew Bell to be appointed to the Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2022.

- (B) One Member on the Health & Wellbeing Board, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2022.

Nominations received:-

Randall Keith Anderson

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Randall Anderson to be appointed to the Health & Wellbeing Board, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2022.

11. Questions There were no questions.

12. Motions There were no Motions.

13. **CITY OF LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD**

(Deputy James Michael Douglas Thomson)

18 August 2021

City of London Police: Annual Report 2020/21

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

The Chairman introduced the item to the Court and provided a comprehensive overview of the City Police's achievements over the year, as well as a summary of the constructive challenge provided by the Police Authority Board across the

period.

Resolved – That the report be received.

14. **POLICY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)

16 August 2021

Report of Urgent Action Taken: 9 September 2021 meeting of the Court of Common Council – physical / formal meeting arrangements

In April 2021, the Court of Common Council resolved that all of its local and police authority meetings should be conducted on an informal basis for the coming period, in view of the ongoing Covid-19 related restrictions. This decision was taken bearing in mind the prohibitions on remote / virtual participation in formal meetings under relevant legislation and the impracticalities of holding formal meetings (particularly of the Court itself, given its size), with the Court also resolving to allow for virtual participation in non-local or police authority business more generally. These arrangements expire on 7 October.

On 5 July 2021, Her Majesty's Government announced that all Covid-related work from home guidance and social distancing restrictions were anticipated to come to an end as of 19 July 2021. The decision was, therefore, taken (on the recommendation of the Policy & Resources Committee) to hold the next meeting of Court of Common Council on 22 July as a formal, in-person meeting, but with committees and sub-committees continuing to operate on an informal basis, thereby facilitating virtual / remote participation for those meetings. The Covid-related situation could then be monitored over the summer recess, with a view to taking a longer-term decision in September.

The 22 July 2021 meeting of the Court subsequently proceeded on a physical basis and was held successfully, utilising various mitigations to help alleviate concerns associated with Covid (for example, an outdoor luncheon, spaced seating, reduced public attendance, and so on). At that meeting, in response to a query around the format of the September Court meeting, hope was expressed that the Corporation would be in a position to repeat the arrangements but that there would need to be a "wait and see" approach over the coming weeks, depending on the situation with Covid and any subsequent response by the Government.

Consequently, the position was assessed during the month of August, with a view to determining arrangements and ensuring that Members were provided with sufficient notice ahead of September's meeting. In reviewing the position it was felt that, whilst the threat of Covid remained, there was no indication that the Government was likely to introduce any new restrictions and, indeed, the message of returning to the workplace was one they continued to promulgate. Accordingly, it was determined that September's Court meeting should proceed on a physical basis and be held in a similar manner to the July meeting, i.e. employing Covid mitigation measures so far as was practical, notwithstanding the removal of restrictions generally.

A decision was taken under urgency procedures in view of the summer recess and the need to provide sufficient notice for requisite arrangements to be made and the

Court Summons published within statutory timeframes.

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

15. **STATUES WORKING GROUP**

(Douglas Gordon Fleming Barrow, M.B.E.)

2 August 2021

Report of Urgent Action Taken: Statues Working Group – Request for extension to timetable

In March 2021, the Court of Common Council endorsed the establishment of the Statues Working Group and granted authority to it, under Standing Order No. 9(2), to report directly to the Court. In so doing, it requested that the Working Group's recommendations be submitted to it by the end of September 2021.

The Working Group had since met on multiple occasions and was now almost in a position to submit its findings. However, given the importance of the subject, it was felt that one further meeting in early September was required to finalise the proposals and ensure a robust report could be submitted to the Court. In view of the timing of the Court meeting in September, this meant that, although the Working Group's proposals would be published within the Court papers (for October's meeting) by the end of September, the Court would not have the opportunity to consider proposals until its 7 October 2021 meeting.

The approval of the Court was, therefore, sought and obtained under urgency procedures for an extension to the timescale set, facilitating an October submission.

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

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

1st August 2021

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development etc.) (England) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order 2021 No. 814

This Order amends the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GPDO), which provides for the granting of permission for certain classes of development without the requirement for a planning application to be made under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Order amends the GPDO to require developers to obtain the prior approval of the local planning authority as to certain matters relating to fire safety, where it is proposed to introduce dwellinghouses in buildings 18 metres or more in height or containing 7 or more storeys. Where a prior approval application is made pursuant to these provisions, the local planning authority must consult the Health and Safety Executive.

The School Admissions Code (Appointed Day) (England) Order 2021 No. 833

1st September 2021

This Order appoints 1st September 2021 as the day on which the School Admissions Code comes into force. The Code imposes requirements and includes guidelines setting out aims, objectives and other matters in relation to the arrangements for admission to maintained schools. This applies to the Aldgate School, the only City of London school that is a maintained school. The Code replaces the previous School Admissions Code, which came into force in 2014, except in relation to applications for places at a maintained school made before the Code comes into force.

The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (Steps etc.) (England) (Revocation and Amendment) Regulations 2021 No. 848

18th July 2021

These Regulations revoke a raft of existing Coronavirus Regulations, including those providing for lockdown and social distancing requirements, the wearing of face coverings in certain places, the collection of contact details by businesses, and other obligations on and undertakings by businesses. They do not, however, revoke all COVID restrictions, for example those relating to travel and self-isolation remain in force. The Regulations also postpone the expiry of the Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (England) (No. 3) Regulations 2020 from 19th July 2021 to 28th September 2021. The 2020 Regulations give local authorities powers to give directions relating to premises, events and public outdoor places in their areas, if they consider that specified the public health, necessity and proportionality conditions are met.

The Business and Planning Act 2020 (Pavement Licences) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2021 No. 866

20th July 2021

In response to the coronavirus pandemic, the Business and Planning Act 2020 made temporary provision for a fast-track process to allow businesses selling food or drink to obtain pavement licences from local authorities, which authorise the placement of furniture such as tables and chairs on highways adjacent to their premises. These Regulations extend the application of the Act's provisions on pavement licences, and the date until which pavement licences may run, from 30th September 2021 to 30th September 2022. This extension to 2022 only applies to pavement licences for which applications are made on or after 20th July 2021. The 2021 expiry date will continue to apply in relation to any pavement licence applied for before 20th July 2021, though the holder of such a licence may be able to apply for a further licence.

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

Read.

17. Resolutions There were no resolutions.

18. Hospital Seal There were no docquets for the Seal.

19. Awards & Prizes There was no report.

20. *Mooney, B.D.F., Deputy; Ingham Clark, R.J., Deputy* *Resolved* – That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business below on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

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

21. Non-public minutes *Resolved* – That the non-public minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.

The meeting commenced at 1.00pm and ended at 1.30pm

BARRADELL.

The Election of Chief Commoner – to be considered in conjunction with Item 5

To be presented on Thursday, 7th October 2021

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

To elect a Chief Commoner

The job description of the Chief Commoner can be found on the City's website: <https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/assets/About-us/chief-commoner-job-description.pdf>

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

Simon Duckworth

Elected in 2000, when in my mid 30s, recent years have transformed both the City and Corporation. The socio-economic impact of CV19 has reminded us of the City's fragile eco system.

During my time on the Court, I've been fortunate to serve across the range of Corporation activities. Chairing our Police Authority, Gresham and Guildhall Club were highlights, but represented very different relationships; Policing brought deep engagement with our Police Force, business and residential communities, Gresham focussed on property, educational outreach and the historic Mercers' partnership, and the Club allowed me to appreciate the lived experience of Members working in Guildhall.

Deputy Governorship of the Irish Society, three years as Deputy Chairman of Policy & Resources and my Army sabbatical last year evidenced the sheer breadth of Corporation activity and how the City's soft power helps the UK.

2022 will focus on rebuilding confidence in our businesses and residential communities. I have the energy, experience and connectivity to make a genuine contribution as Chief Commoner, representing the Corporation externally but also supporting Members as we work together to rebuild and sustain the City.

I value the diversity of the Court and if elected will encourage all Members to fully participate in our debates. I hope to support those whose opinions get less well aired, and act as honest broker when arguments occasionally get heated. Above all, I hope to be a Chief Commoner to whom Members can turn for advice and a friendly ear but who understands the scale of what we are trying to achieve in our work for this City and its communities.

I hope you feel that my commitment, energy and experience will be useful to the City in the Jubilee year, and that I will help represent and support all Members if elected as Chief Commoner.

Ann Holmes

The post of Chief for 2022/3 will be a challenging full time job, for which I'm well prepared. I would support members, and represent their interests, in what are likely to prove testing times.

I've served on ten grand committees, three of which I've chaired, and on many sub committees and working parties. I have an excellent record of attendance and input, hard work and diligence.

As well as familiarising me with the detail of policy making and implementation, my experience has made me aware of the high level of member potential. Continuous training and support are required to realise this potential. The Chief chairs the Member Development Steering Group, of which I've been a member since joining the Court, and where I've been able to draw on my significant professional experience in teaching, training and team development. I also serve on the Members' Privileges Sub Committee, which the Chief chairs.

Wise decisions require constructive debate between those holding differing views. I believe my chairing skills and the ways in which I work, and would communicate with members, would set an example of the collegiality which is so essential.

To best serve our electorate, we must ensure members' skill sets and networks are fully utilised. Ways of organising elections and tenure, to achieve this, have been discussed in the Lisvane consultations and giving attention to these issues will be key. I've participated in a very high proportion of these consultations and would involve myself in closely monitoring changes, and regularly discussing these with members.

I feel confident in promoting the City and the Corporation. I love the City, where I've lived for over twenty years. I'm a former member of the IoD City Branch and am currently a Court Assistant with the Worshipful Company of Cordwainers.

Report – Statues Working Group

The Future of Statues in the Guildhall

To be presented on Thursday, 7th October 2021

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

SUMMARY

The City Corporation is united in its commitment to equality, inclusivity and diversity and to tackling slavery and racism in all its forms. The Corporation want to ensure the Square Mile is a place where people of all ethnicities and backgrounds feel safe and welcome. The importance was recognised for all available options in relation to the two statues to be considered fully and a well-informed recommendation be made to the Court based on evidence from all sources.

On 21 January 2021, the Policy & Resources Committee considered the recommendations of the Tackling Racism Taskforce, set up in June 2020 and tasked to consider what the City of London Corporation currently does to tackle racism in all its forms and to assess whether any further action could be undertaken. The Tackling Racism Taskforce recommended the removal of the statues of William Beckford and Sir John Cass from Guildhall.

Subsequently, it was agreed that a Working Group, reporting directly to the Court, should be established to consider the future of these two statues specifically, located within the Guildhall. The Court of Common Council considered and made appointments to the Statues Working Group at its meeting on 4 March 2021 and, following expressions of interest from the full Court, Policy & Resources did the same at its meeting on 11 March 2021.

This report sets out the recommendations of the Working Group following consideration of options open to the Corporation in relation to the statues of Sir John Cass and William Beckford, located within the Guildhall.

In reaching its recommendations, the Working Group was particularly mindful of the need to consider past, present, and future in how it informed the approach to addressing the two items of contested heritage. It was necessary for the Corporation's past and the history of the statues to be fully acknowledged and understood, with present actions reflecting this and future actions to improve diversity and inclusion, in addition to providing educational opportunities, across the City of London and beyond be considered.

RECOMMENDATION

The Court of Common Council is **recommended** to:-

- i. accept the Working Group's proposal that the statues of Sir John Cass and William Beckford be retained in the Guildhall, but that explanatory plaques or notices be placed alongside them in order to provide contextual information; and,
- ii. to further support the above recommendation of the Statues Working Group, that the educational activities as set out in paragraph 55 of this report be referred to the relevant committees for further consideration.

MAIN REPORT

Background

1. Following the death of George Floyd and subsequent events in May and June 2020, a joint statement was released by the Lord Mayor, Chair of Policy and Resources Committee, Chair of Police Authority Board and Chair of Establishment Committee. Correspondence received arising from this demonstrated the complexities and emotions that surround the issue of racism; nevertheless, it was overwhelmingly clear that the City Corporation needed to do more than just issue a statement calling for change and needed to look at what positive action it should take.
2. At the Policy and Resources Committee on 11 June 2020, a joint Working Party was established to consider what the City of London Corporation currently did to tackle racism in all its forms and to assess whether any further action could be undertaken to promote economic, educational, and social inclusion through our activities, including any historical issues with a view as to how we might respond to them.
3. The Tackling Racism Taskforce (as named upon meeting) met regularly between June 2020 and January 2021, focusing on how the Corporation already tackled racism and identifying what further steps could be taken across six work streams: staffing, governance, police, education, business and culture.
4. A large part of the Culture Workstream focused on contested heritage. The debate over contested heritage, within and outside the City of London, has proven to be politically divisive. Following global protests after the death of George Floyd, there was a re-examination of the suitability of certain contested pieces of heritage, namely public statues that displayed subject matters associated with the transatlantic slave trade and other forms of racism. The protests and forced removal of the Colston Statue in Bristol, for instance, was a catalyst for businesses, educational facilities and civil society organisations to re-assess their own cultural artefacts on public display.
5. Following approval from the Policy and Resources Committee, the Tackling Racism Taskforce launched a consultative exercise in September 2020 to assist in determining what items existed within the City of London and the future suitability of these items being on display.

6. 1580 individual responses to the consultative exercise on historic items were received, with the statues of William Beckford and Sir John Cass being identified as being deemed problematic. A significant majority of external consultees (71%) expressed a view that items of contested heritage such as statues and street and building names associated with slavery and racism, should be retained on public display and remain in situ. However, the exercise also found that a significant majority of internal consultees (75%) expressed a view that these should be either contextualised or removed from public display.
7. While the views expressed were taken into account, it was always the intention that the Taskforce would make a recommendation based on the wider issues rather than being obliged to adopt any majority view expressed during the consultative exercise. As such, the Taskforce concluded that every effort should be made to explore removal of the Beckford statue, an individual whose vast wealth came from plantations in Jamaica and the large numbers of enslaved Africans working for him. It should however be noted that while their philanthropic actions were endorsed through profits from slavery, neither statue was commissioned in direct recognition of this, but to celebrate their achievements throughout their lifetimes.
8. Members should note that the Great Hall, Guildhall, is a Grade I Listed Building. Therefore, any fixtures inside and out are protected. To remove or make any alterations to a statue would require Listed Building Consent (LBC), which would be subject to consultation with statutory bodies and public consultation. An application would need to be supported by a heritage statement which describes the significance of the heritage assets affected including any contribution made by their setting. There is also the cost of making good the stonework behind the statue. Listing Status recognises the importance and significance of buildings and offers statutory protection against unsympathetic alteration or demolition. Approximately 1% of listed buildings are Grade I and 4% Grade II*. The inclusion of The Great Hall, Guildhall, in the Grade I list gives national recognition to a most important and unique building.
9. At the Policy and Resources Committee on 21 January 2021, the recommendations of the Tackling Racism Taskforce were presented and approved including recommendations for the statue of William Beckford to be removed from the Great Hall to a more suitable location and for the statue of Sir John Cass to be returned to the Sir John Cass Foundation. It was recommended that the statues be temporarily covered while a working group, led by City Arts Initiative members, be established to manage the transfer of the statues and consider appropriate replacement artwork.
10. However, noting the constraints within which the Taskforce had operated and the multitude of issues with which it had grappled in a relatively condensed period of time, it was subsequently felt that a more detailed exploration of this particular item by a dedicated Working Group might yield the opportunity for a more nuanced consideration of the range of options available, thereby affording the benefit of more in-depth deliberations.

11. In view of the significance and Member interest in the matter, it was considered that any final decision should be reserved for the Court of Common Council, rather than taken by an individual Committee. Therefore, at the Policy and Resources Committee on 18 February 2021, Members subsequently considered and agreed the following resolution:
1. To Establish a Statues Member/Officer Working Group of 12 persons, 5 members to be elected by the Policy & Resources Committee (one of whom should be the Chair of the Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee) together with a further 5 members elected by the Court of Common Council and 2 Officers.
 2. That the Terms of Reference of the Statues Working Group be as follows:
 - a. To consider and fully evaluate a wide range of options for addressing concerns relating to the Guildhall statues of William Beckford and Sir John Cass.
 - b. To provide by the end of September 2021 a full report to the Court, setting out the options considered, the evaluations of those options and recommendations to the Court.
 3. That, until the Court has considered the Report of the Statues Working Group and agreed how to proceed with these statues, no further action be taken or commitment made in relation to them.
12. The concurrence and endorsement of the Court of Common Council was subsequently obtained in respect of this approach, with the Group authorised to report its evaluations of options considered and recommendations directly to the Court in September 2021, pursuant to Standing Order 9(2).

Current Position

13. Following the initial meeting of the (Statues Working) Group in April 2021, where Members met to elect a Chair and consider a timetable of future meetings, the Group met on three occasions to consider the range of options in relation to the statues of Sir John Cass and William Beckford in the Guildhall.
14. The City Corporation is united in its commitment to equality, inclusivity and diversity and to tackling slavery and racism in all its forms. The Corporation want to ensure the Square Mile is a place where people of all ethnicities and backgrounds feel safe and welcome. In undertaking its deliberations, therefore, it was recognised by the Group that the issue of contested heritage was one with a worldwide context and where there was a significant division of opinion. Nevertheless, they felt it important to consider all available options in relation to the two statues and make a well-informed recommendation to the Court based on evidence from all sources.
15. In undertaking its deliberations, the Working Group was particularly mindful of the need to consider past, present, and future in how it constructed an approach. Firstly, there was a critical importance in acknowledging and understanding past actions and the context of those, together with their impact on the present, in order to inform a genuine and constructive mechanism for addressing and coming to terms with the organisation's history. Actions in the present are needed to reflect this, with a coherent explanation of the steps to be taken. Contextualisation would

not be limited to a simple plaque, but be something rather more extensive and with the ability to evolve. Finally and, perhaps most crucially, the challenge of addressing this for the future: whilst not in the remit of the Working Group, it was clear that action must be taken to improve educational equality, diversity and inclusion across the City of London and beyond. The Group felt that directly supporting those impacted by the statues would be more beneficial than funding costly amendments to the statues themselves.

16. As one available source of information to aid their deliberations, the Group commissioned a limited stakeholder-led consultative exercise to assess the views of relevant stakeholders on options pertaining to the statues of William Beckford and Sir John Cass, located in the Guildhall estate. This was to build upon the initial consultative exercise conducted by the Tackling Racism Taskforce, allowing a clearer focus on the two statues in question.
17. In commissioning the exercise, the Group highlighted that its purpose was to gain more information to aid the Group's decision making, however, the Group also noted in doing so that it should not be bound by the results.
18. The Group debated whether to pursue another public consultation or a limited exercise. Whilst some Members were concerned about a lack of transparency, it was decided, that the views of those most directly impacted by the statues (i.e. our stakeholders) should be prioritised on this occasion. This was deemed more feasible within the given timeframe of the Group and Members felt that delaying their recommendations in order to conduct another longer exercise so similar to that conducted previously could not be justified. It was also noted by Members that the initial consultative exercise may have experienced an imbalanced contribution from particular groups involved in the political debate and it was felt that this should be avoided if possible.
19. The timeline for this consultative exercise was set between 1 June and 16 July 2021, allowing time for relevant stakeholders to provide a response to the engagement while recognising the urgency in gaining insight into stakeholders' views before making a recommendation to the Court.
20. The exercise sought views from a range of City Corporation stakeholders including:
 - a. All Common Council Members
 - b. Full Staff Network, including the BAME (Black Asian and Minority Ethnic) Staff Network
 - c. The Livery
 - d. City Education Stakeholders
 - e. Culture & Heritage Sector
 - f. City Bridge Trust Stakeholders
 - g. Guildhall Client List
 - h. Socio-Economic Diversity Taskforce
 - i. Key Financial, Professional and Related Services (FPRS) Stakeholders

21. There were 467 responses to the exercise, with the following key findings:
- a. The majority of responses came from City Corporation staff (71%); however, this stakeholder group was also the largest group consulted, by a significant margin. The response rate for elected Members of Court (38%) was the highest of the stakeholder sub-groups consulted.
 - b. The response rate for external organisations was relatively low and a significant number chose not to respond to the survey. A number of organisations responded to say they were unable or did not want to complete the survey.
 - c. A majority (55%) of respondents said they were not aware of the Beckford statue, prior to receiving the survey, whilst a majority (57%) of respondents said they were aware of the Cass statue.
 - d. When considering all the options, most respondents (48% for Beckford & 47% for Cass) believed the statues were negative features of the Guildhall estate. A small number of respondents viewed the statues as positive features of the Guildhall estate (15% for Beckford & 17% for Cass). The remaining responses either viewed the statues as neutral features of the estate (25% for Beckford & 26% for Cass) or chose not to respond.
 - e. There was no significant difference between the number of responses that stated the perception of the City Corporation was diminished by the Beckford and Cass statues, with those responses that stated the statues did not impact the overall perception of the City Corporation.
 - f. A majority of respondents (62% for Beckford & 65% for Cass) believed the perception of the City Corporation would be diminished if the statues remained unamended.
 - g. A majority of respondents (52% for Beckford & 50% for Cass) believed the perception of the City Corporation would be improved if the statues were retained and reinterpreted.
 - h. No majority of respondents expressed a clear view on the question of whether the perception of the City Corporation would be diminished or improved if the statues of Cass and Beckford were re-sited.
 - i. In total, when considering all consultees preferences regarding the options pertaining to the two statues, most respondents expressed a view that the City Corporation should retain the statues with appropriate reinterpretations (42% for Beckford & 43% for Cass). Less popular preferences among respondents were the re-siting of the two statues (39% for Beckford & 37% for Cass) and the retaining of the statues unamended (9% for both Beckford & Cass). The remaining respondents either 'did not know', 'preferred not to say', or did not answer.
 - j. Of those respondents that expressed a clear indicative preference on the future of the two statues (excluding those that 'did not know', 'preferred not to say', or did not answer) there was a majority in favour of the retention of the statues in some form (56% for Beckford & 58% for Cass). A minority of consultees therefore expressed a preference to re-site the statues to an appropriate educational facility, or somewhere less prominent within the Guildhall estate (44% for Beckford & 42% for Cass).

- k. Of the stakeholder sub-groups consulted, the majority of Members of Court of Common Council expressed a view the statues should be retained with appropriate reinterpretations (58% for Beckford & 60% for Cass). The majority of external stakeholders expressed the view the statues should be retained with appropriate reinterpretations (53% for Beckford & 52% for Cass). The highest number of responses from the City of London Corporation staff network expressed a preference to re-site the statues (44% for Beckford & 43% for Cass).

Options and Proposal

22. Given the results of the initial consultative exercise, conducted by the Tackling Racism Taskforce, it was widely recognised that the statues were deemed contentious and therefore the Group felt there was a moral imperative for some action be taken. It is for this reason that taking no action, one of the potential options, was deemed to be inappropriate and therefore dismissed by the Group.
23. The options open to Members then broadly fell under two headings, each of which had several options that could be considered. Those options were:
- i) Removal/re-siting of the statues with a new a more appropriate location for them identified, either within or external to the Guildhall
 - ii) Retain the statues in their existing locations, but with additions being made or information provided to provide greater context (retain and explain)
24. A range of supporting information was considered by Members as part of their deliberations including but not limited to estimated costs (although it was noted that the figures were very rough estimates due to the limited timescales available for all options to be accurately costed and tested), results of the limited stakeholder-led consultative exercise, examples of how other organisations had dealt with items of contested heritage, detailed information on the location and history of the statues, biographies of the individuals the statues depict, prior communications with relevant stakeholders, and published guidance from relevant organisations such as Historic England.

Removal / Re-siting

25. The Group considered the possibility of re-siting the statues as a viable option for reducing the assigned importance of the statues by way of physical location, especially given the history of the Beckford statue in other locations within the Guildhall. However, it was noted that any re-siting, either within the Guildhall or to a new location, would require the obtaining of LBC (following a further consultation period with relevant stakeholders), during which Historic England and statutory amenity societies would again be consulted. In addition, Members were mindful of the dangers of straightforward removal insofar as it risked impairing understanding of the Corporation's history, observing that contextualising them in a way that provided the full context and historical implications was educationally beneficial.
26. Should the City Corporation's planning and listed building consent applications receive any objections from Historic England or the Amenity Societies during

consultation, the application(s) would be referred to the Secretary of State (Local Government). If no objections were received, then the City Corporation might determine the application.

27. However, it was noted that the Secretary of State (Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government) had set out the Government's position, and the Group noted his letter to the Lord Mayor and Members in response to the Policy and Resources Committee's initial decision to remove and re-site, which was widely reported. In that letter, the Secretary of State also set out the position of Historic England with whom the City Corporation must consult in order to acquire Listed Building Consent, explaining *"Our [Historic England's] stance on historic statues and sites which have become contested is to retain and explain them; to provide thoughtful, long lasting and powerful reinterpretation that responds to their contested history and tells the full story."*

28. Additionally, prior to this, in September 2020, the Culture Secretary Oliver Dowden wrote to Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport arm's length bodies to outline the Government's position on contested heritage. The letter stated:

"....the Government does not support the removal of statues or other similar objects. Historic England, as the Government's adviser on the historic environment, have said that removing difficult and contentious parts of it risks harming our understanding of our collective past. Rather than erasing these objects, we should seek to contextualise or reinterpret them in a way that enables the public to learn about them in their entirety, however challenging this may be. Our aim should be to use them to educate people about all aspects of Britain's complex past, both good and bad."

29. The Government formally updated the 'National Planning Policy Framework' on 20 July 2021, to include new amendments pertaining to heritage items. The framework sets out the requirement of local planning authorities to ensure the 'retain and explain' policy is implemented in regard to heritage items. The updated document states *"In considering any applications to remove or alter a historic statue, plaque, memorial or monument (whether listed or not), local planning authorities should have regard to the importance of their retention in situ and, where appropriate, of explaining their historic and social context rather than removal."*

30. Despite being aware of these views, the group were in agreement that the Corporation should not be bound by the view of the current Government and that this should not be the only evidence considered in reaching a recommendation.

31. Members noted estimated costs for removal of both statues (approximately £100,000 for Beckford and £7,500 for Cass, in addition to supplementary associated costs) which, on balance, some Members felt to be too substantial to justify pursuing this option, especially due to the current financial implications of the COVID-19 pandemic.

32. Further complications associated with re-siting included finding an appropriate new location for the statues, with recognition that officers had received responses of a cautious approach from City-based museum and galleries to housing these statues, and identifying a subject for and commissioning a new artwork to replace either statue.
33. In addition to the above, the Group received the results of both consultative exercises and noted that there were only low levels of demand from respondents for removal of either statue.
34. For all reasons listed above the Group felt that it would be impracticable to pursue either removal or re-siting of the William Beckford statue.
35. Regarding the statue of Sir John Cass, Members discussed return of the statue to its owners, the Sir John Cass Foundation, with agreement that this would be preferable as they were the legal owners and therefore responsible for deciding its future. However, Members were informed that early correspondence with the Foundation had established that this was not an option because they themselves had nowhere to display or store it. In this correspondence, the Foundation expressed preference for the statue being relocated to a museum or gallery. However, the Group noted that LBC would also be required for relocation of this statue due to its fixture to the porch wall which is Grade I listed. For the reasons outlined above, the Group recognise that such consent may not be easily granted. Following the Court's decision, based on the Group's recommendations below, the Foundation may wish to recall the statue if they disagree with the Corporation's approach.
36. There was also consensus amongst the Group that the City Corporation should remain consistent in its actions towards items of contested heritage and, in considering this, alongside the aforementioned difficulties, Members concluded that re-siting should not be pursued for the statue of Sir John Cass.
37. ***Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, the Group do not recommend that removal / re-siting is pursued for the statues of either William Beckford or Sir John Cass.***

Retain and Explain

38. If the statues are retained, there are four main routes that may be explored. They are:
- A. **Explanation** (explaining the statues' context by way of a plaque or notice)
 - B. **Concealment** (boarding over or otherwise concealing the statues)
 - C. **Artistic interpretation** (adding to the statue in a way that is strongly impactful visually to deliver context)
 - D. **Counterpointing** (commission an artwork(s) to 'counterpoint' the statues)

Explanation (Option A)

39. Listed Building Consent (LBC) is unlikely to be required for interpretative plaques (option A) if the mechanisms were freestanding and not attached to the fabric of the building or the statues. The Group considered the possibility of altering or adding to the inscription below the Beckford statue but, upon being informed that amending any integral parts of the statue would require LBC, this was dismissed as it was felt that doing so would not be considered favourably in any such application.
40. As there are currently no informative plaques for any of the memorials in the Great Hall, the Group also considered the possibility of recommending that all nine monuments have plaques or notices. However, it was felt that priority should be given to the statues in question at this point in time.
41. Members noted several arguments against the use of plaques in educational environments, as they were viewed as less engaging, as well as the anticipated negative reputational impacts for the City Corporation in doing so. However, they felt that this offered the most viable way forward in offering sufficient explanation without requiring LBC, and at a reasonable cost (approximately £2,000 for both statues). They do however recommend that such a plaque take advantage of modern technology such as a QR code to allow for more cohesive, flexible and modern engagement with the contextual information. This would allow for the content to be adapted over time or for specific events, if appropriate, and include multi-media for enhanced engagement. It would also offer greater flexibility in meeting various accessibility requirements.
42. ***It is for these reasons that the Group express a preference for the option of retaining and explaining the statues by way of plaque or notice (option A).***
43. In implementation, this Group proposes that officers be asked to work collaboratively with the City Arts Initiative, in consultation with all relevant stakeholders, to develop appropriate explanatory text.
44. The Group's deliberations surrounding the three other routes of explanation can be seen below.

Concealment (Option B)

45. LBC for concealment of the statues (option B) would only likely be obtained if the mechanism were freestanding and not attached to the fabric of the building or the statues to be covered. Risk assessments and method statements would however be required to ensure the structure is stable and safe and that no work would be carried out which would affect the character of the statues, or that of the Guildhall, as a building of special architectural or historic interest, listed Grade I.
46. Although the Group recognised the merit of the Tackling Racism Taskforce's original suggestion of temporary concealment of the Beckford statue, in demonstrating positive action, the Group had concerns about the practicalities of

doing so, especially for a temporary basis only. Whichever mechanism was used to conceal either or both statues would need to be innovative providing a solution fitting to the Guildhall's function as a business and ceremonial events venue as well as address the complexity of covering Beckford, noting its size (5.5m high by 3.3m wide) and position in front of a stained-glass window and air ventilation units.

47. The Group understood that more obvious concealments that overtly addressed the contextual background of the statue may be preferable to the former, both aesthetically and educationally, but would be difficult to implement without impacting the capacity of the venue. The Group noted an occasion in which an artwork within the Guildhall was required to be covered with cloth for a state visit which was not received well as many found it not to have been aesthetically pleasing.
48. Overall the Group felt that this option should be avoided if possible due to the implications on the Guildhall's role as a business and ceremonial events venue but, if the Court were to pursue this route, felt that every effort should be taken to provide an aesthetically pleasing solution with limited impact on the Guildhall as a venue.

Artistic Interpretation (Option C)

49. Option C proposed that the statues be artistically interpreted in order to contextualise the subjects' links with slavery. This would see the City Corporation commission an artist (or artists) to develop additional infrastructure to better explain the statue. The Group noted that, in some views, this may be seen as preferable to explanation by plaque as it offered more engagement for viewers of the statues.
50. In this scenario, LBC would likely be needed, excepting where the method used does not impact on the physical structure of the monument (e.g. if video mapping onto the statues were used). As with concealment, issues over appropriateness to the building's context and to its function as a civic and business-hire venue would also need to be given if this route were pursued.
51. With this option, the Group recognised that a new artwork would need to be commissioned which would result in substantial costs for research, project management, artist fees, production and installation. With this in mind, in addition to the potential aforementioned implications on the Guildhall as a ceremonial venue, the Group felt that other options should be prioritised at this time.

Counterpointing (Option D)

52. Option D is the opportunity to counterpoint the Beckford and Cass statues with two other artworks (or just one). Counterpointing is a practice whereby artworks depicting subjects that "offset" negative representations elsewhere within a place/space are located at strategic positions in counterpoint to them (that place or space can sometimes be a country, state or city meaning that should Members choose to retain the Beckford and Cass and counterpoint them, they may commission a work to sit on another part of the City Corporation's City estate or within its public realm).

53. Members noted the views that counterpointing at the same site as the controversial statue offered a higher impact on those viewing the statue but that counterpointing in a different location benefitted from the lack of requirement for LBC and could offer an opportunity to engage on this matter with London's communities to demonstrate positive action more publicly. As with artistic interpretation, there would also be significant costs involved in commissioning any counterpoint artwork which the Group felt could not, currently, be justified.

54. Members noted the pre-existing 'Gilt of Cain' memorial to the abolition of the slave trade, located in Fen Court. They would welcome the opportunity for another separate memorialisation to be considered when appropriate, to be located either within the Guildhall or elsewhere on the City's estate.

Educational Opportunities

55. In considering the various options, the Group noted there were a variety of educational activities that could be undertaken in support of their recommendation. Your Working Group, therefore, urges the relevant committees to consider pursual of some or all of these proposals, in addition to the recommendation to retain (and explain) the statues. These include:

- a. Reframing the space in which the statues are located by hosting educational and cultural events that directly address the context of the statues and the contemporary issues they raise.
- b. Using speeches at City hosted events to recognise the implications of slavery and the City's involvement in historic slavery.
- c. Introducing virtual resources offering education on the slave trade and providing a platform for those affected to share their experiences.
- d. Providing bursaries to encourage members of local BAME communities to train to become City Guides.
- e. Developing Black history consistently across curriculum in the City's schools and offering continued professional development for teachers.
- f. Funding collaborative research projects which support knowledge exchange to understand the global impact of the slave trade both past and present and enable the development of material to support the wider curriculum, revision of textbooks and the development of teaching and learning guides.
- g. Proactively supporting initiatives such as Black Pound Day.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

56. **Strategic implications:** noting the attention received in the media by other organisations who have done the same, a decision which counters that recommended by the Tackling Racism Taskforce is likely to attract media attention and may be perceived negatively by stakeholders, including staff, businesses and London's communities. Depending on how interpretation is provided for the statues, the retention of Beckford and Cass may also be seen as contrary to the City of London Corporation's commitments to equality and inclusion as they appear in the Corporate Plan, Recovery Taskforce Strategy ([Square Mile: Future City](#)), and Culture and Commerce Taskforce Report ([Fuelling Creative Renewal](#)). The

alignment with Government's 'retain and explain' policy will, however, be supported by Government, including DCMS and its arm's length bodies.

57. **Financial implications:** all financial implications are included within the costings however it must be noted that these are only estimates. It is suggested that a contingency of between 15% and 20% (as a margin of error) is added to any budget allocation. Confirmation of the decision, and subsequent planning to inform the manner of interpretation, will enable more accurate costings. Noting the modest cost of plaques (at £2,000) and any additional research costs to ensure appropriate representation, finance may be met locally from the Cultural and Visitor Development budget up to a ceiling of £16,000. This does not account for any future visual interpretation or counterpointing, nor does it cover the education proposals in this report.
58. **Resource implications:** further research and planning will be necessary to inform the design and content of interpretation, which will have resource implications in terms of officer time.
59. **Legal implications:** to avoid the requirement of LBC and Planning Consent, it is recommended that the interpretation should not impact the statues nor the fabric of the building.
60. **Risk implications:** the strategic implications cited above may entail reputational risks. There is likely to be media coverage and comment, and this could be extensive given the variation of views on the issue. A decision which counters that recommended by the Tackling Racism Taskforce may create a perception of non-inclusiveness. The limited participation of underrepresented groups in decision making on issues that impact them may also create a perception of inequality. How the City of London Corporation designs and develops the interpretation of its statues may also cause contention, and it is recommended that this should be co-created with a range of external experts and London's diverse communities. The media coverage may be long running with the images of Beckford and Cass used as symbols of the debate over contested heritage in future months and years.
61. **Equalities implications:** these appear within the report and above under strategic implications and risk implications. It is recommended that interpretation of the statues should be designed to incorporate accessibility advice.
62. **Climate implications:** it is recommended that Members instruct officers to ensure appropriate materials and low-carbon options are considered within the delivery of any interpretation.

Conclusion

63. The Statues Working Group was established in March 2021, following the recommendations of the Tackling Racism Taskforce, to consider and fully evaluate a wide range of options for addressing concerns relating to the Guildhall statues of William Beckford and Sir John Cass and report their recommendations to the Court in September 2021. This report outlines its deliberations in reaching the conclusion to retain both statues in their existing locations but place an explanatory plaque or notice alongside to provide further context on the individuals.

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

DATED this 6th day of September 2021.

SIGNED on behalf of the Working Group.

Douglas Gordon Fleming Barrow, M.B.E.
Chair, Statues Working Group

Report – Policy & Resources Committee, Culture Heritage & Libraries Committee

Destination City: Strategic Review

To be presented on Thursday, 7th October 2021

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

SUMMARY

Destination City - Strategic Review is a proposed programme of work setting out a renewed vision for the Square Mile to become the world's most attractive destination for workers, residents and visitors.

Your Policy and Resources Committee and Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committees consider that delivery of this renewed vision is vital for stimulating the City's post-Covid recovery. In order to achieve this expeditiously, your Committees presents proposals for streamlined governance of the work programme, identifying the primary Committees with responsibility for overseeing the review and suggestions for wider engagement. The governance proposal aims to facilitate a fast-paced and agile project that can best equip the City Corporation to swiftly develop an ambitious and long-term plan.

RECOMMENDATION

The Court of Common Council is **recommended** to endorse the proposed strategic review and, in particular, the streamlined governance proposals outlined at paragraphs 11-15.

MAIN REPORT

Background

1. The COVID-19 pandemic continues to create a rapidly changing socioeconomic and cultural landscape. Over the coming years, destinations will need to be even more compelling places to visit, work and invest. The City therefore needs to build on its strengths, but also challenge itself to be more innovative, inclusive and sustainable.
2. The Recovery Taskforce was commissioned in April 2021 by your Policy & Resources and Planning & Transportation Committees to identify objectives actions to ensure the Square Mile remains internationally competitive and locally vibrant. Its report, *Square Mile: Future City*, published in April 2021, provided a blueprint for medium-term recovery from COVID-19. One particular focus of the report was on creating a vibrant offer and included a commitment to a strategic review of the City's offer.

3. This will build on key existing strategies including the Visitor Strategy 2019-23 and Cultural Strategy 2018-22, as well as the Transport Strategy and the Climate Action Plan.

Current Position

4. The proposed strategic review, labelled *Destination City*, aims to assess and benchmark the City's current offer as a destination for workers, visitors and residents. Setting out the vision for the City's future offer, the key output from this work will be a set of specific, detailed and evidence-based recommendations to deliver this. A summary overview document is provided at Appendix 1.
5. The review will provide findings and conclusions for Members to consider, focusing on three key deliverables:
 - a. **A new vision for the City as a destination:** ambitious and wide-ranging, this will provide a touchstone for prioritising activities and embedding a shared vision for growth, covering both internal stakeholders and external partners.
 - b. **Recommendations for developing the City's offer as a destination:** improving the City's offer and appeal, this will identify specific activities and actions that will boost the City's draw as a destination with a range of audiences, immediately and over the next five years.
 - c. **Recommendations for promoting the City's offer as a destination:** this will set out recommendations and strategies for showcasing the City's appeal to a range of new and existing target groups.
6. The review will span all the elements that make for an attractive destination, engaging with numerous sectors including retail, hospitality, culture and heritage, and the night-time economy.
7. Numerous business areas across the City Corporation will be consulted to gather evidence and co-create a shared vision, while testing the feasibility and implications of proposed activities.
8. External engagement and relationship building will also be an integral pillar of the programme. Interviews and workshops with stakeholders will identify the City's strengths, as well as new activities for development. This work will be underpinned by research exploring innovations in other global destinations.
9. The review will be led by Danny Lopez, founding head of London & Partners and former Consul General in New York. Danny will be working on a pro bono basis. A summary CV is provided in Appendix 2. He will be supported by Kate Keating, an external advisor with extensive experience in marketing.
10. The report will go to the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee, then Policy & Resources Committee in the winter months. It is hoped that this will then be submitted to Court early next year.

Governance Arrangements

11. At this preliminary stage of the strategic review, it is difficult to say with certainty which committees' remits will be impacted by proposals and to what extent; however, it is known that the primary Committees with whom responsibility rests are the Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee (given its responsibility for the City Corporation's current culture and visitor strategies) and the Policy & Resources Committee (with its responsibility for the City Corporation's overall policies, strategic priorities, and resource allocation).
12. The review will establish short and medium term actions intended to be deployed from early 2022. By delivering the project at pace, it will equip the City with an offer that reflects the evolving needs of City businesses and their consumers in a radically changed economic and social landscape.
13. Given the importance of the recovery, pace is vital in delivering this workstream. It is, therefore, proposed that the two aforementioned committees be entrusted to consider emerging proposals and present them to the Court. Where there are implications for other Committees, it is suggested that their perspectives are reflected by their Chairs serving in an ex-officio capacity on Policy & Resources and Culture Heritage & Libraries, or (where not already Members) their being invited to attend and contribute for discussion of the item at the relevant meeting. Wider engagement with other relevant Chairs will be provided during the programme to ensure that their Committees' interests are considered against the emerging proposals. In addition, the final recommendations will be taken to the Court of Common Council for approval.
14. The Chairs and Deputy Chairs of Policy & Resources and Culture Heritage and Libraries will also ensure there is oversight as the Review progresses.
15. It is hoped that proposed governance arrangements will provide the maximum opportunity to facilitate Member engagement, whilst also enabling swift and impactful project delivery.
16. Your Policy & Resources and Culture Heritage & Libraries Committees have endorsed the above proposed streamlined governance arrangements.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

- **Strategic implications:** This goes to the heart of the Corporate Plan in underpinning the aim of having a vibrant and thriving City. The outputs are also likely to provide an update and assess the existing 2018-22 Cultural Strategy and 2019-23 Visitor Strategy which were both created prior to the pandemic.
- **Resource and financial implications:** Funding has already been agreed for the delivery of the project. The outcomes of the project will inform a subsequent review of resources across Cultural and Visitor Development. This will be sent to the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee at a later stage.

- **Legal implications:** No legal implications have been identified at this stage. This will be kept under review.
- **Risk implications:** At this stage in the project, no significant risks have been identified. This will be kept under review.
- **Equalities implications:** Underpinning the review will be diversity and inclusion. At this stage in the project, no negative equalities implications have been identified. This will be kept under review and equalities analysis will be carried out if necessary, to ensure negative impacts can be mitigated and opportunities for positive impacts exploited.
- **Climate implications:** This will be fully in line with the Climate Action Strategy and will look to drive the implementation of the actions that Members have agreed.
- **Security implications:** There are no security implications which have been identified at this stage in the project. This will be kept under review.

Conclusion

17. The City is unique, combining a rich history with a huge capacity for re-invention. It has faced countless challenges in the past and has always emerged as a global destination of choice. These unprecedented times have reshaped what our audiences want and the City needs to act fast to remain competitive.

Appendices

- **Appendix 1:** Destination City – Scope
- **Appendix 2:** Summary CV - Danny Lopez

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

DATED this 22nd day of September 2021.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committees.

Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Chair, Policy and Resources Committee

Deputy Wendy Hyde
Chair, Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee

Appendix 1: Destination City: Outline Scope

Project purpose and scope

To assess the City of London's offer and promotion as a destination and develop a set of recommendations, to ensure it is:

- One of the world's most attractive destinations for workers, residents and visitors – both business and leisure, domestic and international.
- A globally desirable location destination of choice for businesses, across financial and professional services, creative industries, and the leisure sector.

In the context of the post-pandemic environment, and longer term adaptation to new ways of working, this project will aim to identify what destinations need to offer to stand out as compelling places to visit, work and locate in. Within that context, we seek to outline what existing strengths the City needs to build on and what new offers need to be developed.

This project will assess and benchmark the City's existing offer and current strengths, as well as its distinctive characteristics. Looking to the future, this piece of work will outline new activities for development and set out an overarching ambitious and achievable vision. From this vision, the project will set out the steps needed to roll out a successful implementation, with clear goals and clarity on the resources required.

Encompassing both the City's offer and its promotion to different audiences, the scope of this project will span all the elements that make for an attractive offer, including retail and hospitality; attractions and culture; heritage and architecture; and leisure.

Aligned with destination purpose, the work will need to review and segment target groups within the recommendations. It is important that this project can outline an implementation strategy that will deliver tangible results. An example is the delivery of increased footfall and spend, including during evenings and weekend. Another is supporting the return of workers to City offices as businesses adjust to new ways of working. And cutting across all of the project's recommendations will be a need to improve the attractiveness and perception of the City as destination of choice.

Partnership working will be key to developing the City's offer as a destination. Building on existing collaborations and developing new ones with stakeholders across business, leisure, retail and culture.

Deliverables

Setting out the vision for the City's future offer as a destination, the key output from this work will be a set of specific, detailed and evidence-based recommendations that set out a clear roadmap of activities.

- **The vision for the City as a destination:** Ambitious and wide-ranging, this will provide a touchstone for prioritising activities and unifying internal stakeholders and external partners. Drawing on the City's rich and exciting past, and inspiring its dynamic future. It will draw out the City as innovative, inclusive and sustainable. The evidence-base underpinning this will need to assess the City current offer, benchmark against comparator areas in London, the UK and internationally, while learning from others. The project will look at the contribution made both

directly and indirectly by the destination economy – and set ambitious but achievable goals for what this could become in the future.

- **Recommendations for developing the City's offer as a destination:** Improving the City's offer and appeal in the immediate and medium term, this work will identify specific activities and actions that will boost the City's draw as a destination. It will build on existing strengths such as the distinct nature of the City. However, we need to be creative and have an appetite for change which is why we want to develop new types of products targeted at key groups (eg young workers, international visitors etc) while supporting and enabling creative and leisure providers.

- **Recommendations for promoting the City's offer as a destination:** Effective promotion of the City's offer will be key. This work will set out recommendations and strategies for showcasing the City's appeal to target groups. This will include value propositions for each and how to reach these groups. These recommendations will need to be fully specified in terms of how they can be delivered and resourced. This will include targeted actions for the City of London Corporation – and, critically, how we can work in partnership to amplify reach and impact. Consultation with stakeholders and partners will be crucial across the project delivery, to ensure we have shared common goals and joint initiatives in place to deliver. Finally, it will be important to set out how best all recommendations can be monitored and evaluated in the short, medium and long term.

The City is unique. It combines a rich history spanning centuries with a unique capacity for re-invention. It has faced countless challenges in the past and has always emerged as a global destination of choice. Now, more than ever, as a post-Covid world and an un-precedented digital transformation reshape what our key audiences want, the City needs to act, and act fast.

This project will deliver an ambitious vision and set out a series of recommendations that will have a long-lasting impact on the City's future. The City of London Corporation recognises the importance of this work and looks forward to supporting the process throughout.

Appendix 2: Danny Lopez – Summary CV

Present:

- **Glasswall Solutions – CEO:**

A British cyber security software company employing 50 people (45 in the UK / 5 in the US). Glasswall's clients include defence and intelligence agencies, as well as commercial organisations on both sides of the Atlantic. Chaired by former ICAP founder Michael Spencer, now Lord Spencer.

The company successfully raised a £18M Series A in December 2020

- **Innovate Finance – Board Member**

Innovate Finance is the independent not-for-profit industry body representing the UK's global FinTech community.

- **FinTech Collective - Advisory Role**

A highly successful US-based venture capital firm specialising in early stage fintech investments, which includes London companies. Their three funds to date total circa \$400M.

Previous:

- **British Consul-General to New York (2011-2016)**

Hosted the official launch for the GREAT campaign in 2012, as well as numerous events promoting the visitor, culture and investment economy.

- **London & Partners - CEO – (2009-2011)**

Launched London & Partners and became its first CEO at a crucial time, pre-Olympics.

- **Public Diplomacy Board - Member (2007-2009)**

Represented UK Trade and Investment alongside the CEO of the British Council, the Chair of Visit Britain and senior Foreign and Commonwealth Office staff.

- **UK Trade and Investment – Managing Director of Marketing (2006-2009)**

Responsible for the development and roll-out of the two largest trade and investment global campaigns prior to the GREAT campaign, 'Hit the world running' and 'Take it to the World'. Both were adopted throughout the global Foreign and Commonwealth Office network.

- **Barclays – Head of Inward Investment Unit (2004-2005)**

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – Bridge House Estates Board

Request for Uplift to the Central Contingency Budget

To be presented on Thursday, 7th October 2021

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

SUMMARY

This report has been produced to update Members on the central contingency budgets held by Bridge House Estates (BHE) within the original 2021/22 budget, with approval sought for an uplift to enable the BHE Board to meet unforeseen and/or exceptional items that may be identified during the year. This request has been scrutinised and is endorsed by your Bridge House Estates Board.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Court of Common Council is **recommended**, in discharge of functions for the City Corporation as Trustee of Bridge House Estates (charity reg. no. 1035628) and solely in the charity's best interests, to:

- a) Approve an uplift in central contingency budgets of £810,000; and
- b) Approve the use of currently held contingency budgets of £108,000 as stated in this report.

MAIN REPORT

Background

1. With the constitution of the Bridge House Estates Board ("BHE Board") on the 15 April 2021, unless expressly reserved to the Court of Common Council, the discharge of all the City Corporation's functions as Trustee of BHE are now the responsibility of the BHE Board.
2. Approval of the budget for the charity is amongst the items reserved to the Court of Common Council. The BHE Board is responsible for the determination of resource allocation for the charity in accordance with its strategic policies and any budget set by the Court of Common Council, and making relevant recommendations to the Court of Common Council for the charity's good administration.
3. The annual budgets prepared by departments for the activities of BHE that are within their responsibility do not hold any significant contingencies. A central contingency budget has previously been overseen by the Finance Committee to meet unforeseen and/or exceptional items that may be identified across the range of activities undertaken by the charity.

4. The central contingency budget held for BHE for 2021/22 is £50,000. In comparison, the contingency budgets held by City Fund and City's Cash for 2021/22 are £1 million and £950,000, respectively. In addition to the above central contingency, the BHE budget includes provisions of £175,000 for apprentice costs and £40,000 for contribution pay.
5. To enable smooth decision making for cross-cutting Corporation projects, it was agreed by your BHE Board that the original central contingency budget of £50,000 should be ring-fenced in case of a request for additional funding for a project that affects all three funds, enabling the Finance Committee to consider the impact of the total request. The BHE Board would approve its portion of any such joint project. To date in 2021/22, there have been no new requests for joint funding that affects all three funds, hence this balance remains held in full.

Current Position

6. The establishment of the BHE Board, drawing together in a single committee all decisions relating to the charity, has both increased the level of focus on activities undertaken and drawn attention to new priorities. As a result, it has become clear that the BHE Board would benefit from holding an increased level of central contingency budget, which would be available for both revenue and capital spend.
7. Such a budget would be directly overseen by the BHE Board, responsibility having been transferred from Finance Committee, with requests to the Board for allocations being required to demonstrate why the costs cannot, or should not, be met from existing budget provisions in the usual way.
8. It is therefore proposed that an uplift of £810,000 is requested to the current contingency budget of £50,000 which, together with the £40,000 originally set aside for contribution pay, will provide a total contingency for unidentified requirements of £900,000. As stated, £50,000 of this will be ring-fenced for joint projects of the City Corporation.
9. Whilst in-year revenue spend by the other two main funds of the City Corporation is higher than that for BHE, Members will note that this is a period of significant change for the charity, during which new ways of working are being considered which may require decisions to be taken in-year.
10. Consideration will be given within the 2022/23 budget process for an appropriate recommendation for the BHE Board to consider as to an ongoing level of contingency budget to be held, taking account of the level of free reserves available.
11. Considering decisions agreed at the July and September meetings of the BHE Board, the current position of the central contingency funds held is as follows:

2021/22 Central Contingencies - Uncommitted Balances 15 September 2021					
	BHE Specific £'000	Contribution Pay £'000	Apprentice costs £'000	Joint Projects with City Corporation £'000	Total £'000
Contingencies:					
2021/22 Provision approved		40	175	50	265
2021/22 Provision requested @ Sept 2021	810				810
2021/22 Transfers	40	(40)			0
Total Proposed Provision	850	0	175	50	1,075
Previously agreed allocations @ July 2021	(160)	0	0	0	(160)
Pending request on Sept 21 agenda	(108)	0	0	0	(108)
Total commitments	(268)	0	0	0	(268)
Uncommitted Balances	582	0	175	50	807

12. The commitments stated within the above table cover:

- a. Revenue budget for the year 1 costs of the Climate Action Strategy;
- b. Maintenance costs for Bridgemasters and Horace Jones House, alongside survey and design fees for future required works; and
- c. Costs to support the ongoing implementation of the BHE Strategic Review.

Corporate & Strategic Implications

13. The provision of a suitable contingency budget held by the BHE Board as outlined in this paper support the aims and objectives of BHE's overarching strategy, *Bridging London 2020 – 2045*.
14. If approved, an adjusted forecast for 2021/22 of £810,000 as a centrally held contingency budget, alongside transfer of £40,000 previously set aside for contribution pay, will be funded from unrestricted income funds held, which are above the minimum reserves policy level.

Duties and Powers of the Trustee

15. Except for those matters reserved to the Court of Common Council, the Board will be responsible for all aspects of Bridge House Estates' day-to-day management and administration in the discharge of the City of London Corporation's functions as Trustee of the charity, acting solely in the best interests of the charity, subject always to the delegated authority being exercised in accordance with any strategy, policy and/or procedure set by, or other direction of, the Court.
16. The recommendations have been considered by your BHE Board and are put to this Honourable Court for approval, being in the best interests and for good administration of the charity.

Conclusion

17. This Honourable Court is asked to note the current contingency budgets held by BHE and to approve a suitable level of centrally managed contingency as befits a charity of its scale of operations, and approve an uplift in the level of

contingency held, as well as commitments against the revised contingency budget. Your BHE Board has agreed that these decisions are in the best interests of the charity and seeks the approval of the Court of Common Council to enable important work on behalf of the charity to continue.

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

DATED this 15th day of September 2021

SIGNED on behalf of the Board.

Deputy Dr Giles Robert Evelyn Shilson
Chair, Bridge House Estates Board

Motion –

by Mark Raymond Peter Henry Delano Wheatley

To be presented on Thursday, 7th October 2021

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

Motion:-

‘That this Honourable Court notes and supports:

- The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), and related texts in UK law.
- The United Nations Paris Agreement, and related texts in UK law.

This Honourable Court notes that:

- Progress towards the latter cannot be at the expense of the former.
- This denial of trade-offs in fundamental rights is clear in our Environmental, Social & Governance (ESG strategy).
- Acts of genocide, slavery and forced labour are breaches of the UDHR.
- The UK Parliament has determined that the Government of the People's Republic of China has engaged in such breaches on the Uyghur people particularly in the province of Xinjiang.

This Honourable Court therefore resolves that the City of London Corporation will:

- Review all direct procurement activity (including our investment portfolio), in light of comprehensive consideration of our ESG strategy, and refrain from any further direct purchase of goods or services from companies located in Xinjiang province until this is concluded.
- Commission the Chair of Policy and Resources to report on these matters to the Common Council at our meeting in January 2022.’

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

Mark Wheatley (Mover)

Caroline Addy

Munsur Ali

Rehana Ameer

Matthew Bell

Mary Durcan

Andrew Mayer (Seconder)

Revd. Stephen Haines

Michael Hudson

Natasha Lloyd-Owen

Henrika Priest

Deputy John Scott

This page is intentionally left blank



List of Applications for the Freedom

To be presented on Thursday, 7th October 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.

His Excellency Khaldoon Khalifa Al Mubarak <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor Ald. Vincent Keaveny</i>	a Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
Stephen Voyager Beresford <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Writer <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Battersea, London
Ann Christine Bessey <i>Ann-Marie Jeffreys Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Principal Quality Engineer, retired <i>Citizen and Glover Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Bilton, Warwickshire
Mark Christopher Bowden <i>Steven George Pennell Graham John Peacock</i>	a Bank Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Carmen Citizen and Loriner</i>	Paddock Wood, Kent
Roderick Keith Ogilvy Bremner <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor Christopher Michael Hayward, CC</i>	a Comedian and Impressionist <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Faringdon, Oxfordshire
Katherine Jane Bygrave <i>Norman Edward Chapman Tony Gabriel Willens</i>	a Learning Project Officer <i>Citizen and Glover Citizen and Poulter</i>	Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire
Daniel Francis Dwyer <i>Vincent Dignam John Paul Tobin</i>	a Company Director <i>Citizen and Carman Citizen and Carman</i>	Uxbridge, Middlesex
Charles Richard Edwards <i>Peter Hubert William Ruddy Melvyn Stuart Davis</i>	a Compliance Officer <i>Citizen and Bowyer Citizen and Bowyer</i>	Maldon, Essex

Robert William Mumford Flavin <i>Victoria Elizabeth Russell</i> <i>Deputy Philip Woodhouse</i>	a Communications Company Managing Director <i>Citizen and Arbitrator</i> <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Bere Ferrers, Devon
Jack William Alexander Francois <i>Brian Derek Francois</i> <i>Christopher Thomas Albrow</i>	a Police Officer <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i> <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	Swanley, Kent
Emma Mevagh Glyn <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Ald. Sir Charles Edward Beck Bowman</i>	a Private Equity Officer <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Wandsworth, London
George Edward Godfrey <i>Shravan Joshi</i> <i>Ald. Prof. & Sheriff Michael Raymond Mainelli</i>	a Chartered Accountant and Civil Servant <i>Citizen and Fueller</i> <i>Citizen and World Trader</i>	Hammersmith, London
Ethan Gorsuch-Browne <i>Felipe Gorsuch-Browne</i> <i>Melvyn Helia Gorsuch-Browne</i>	an Accounts Assistant <i>Citizen and Cooper</i> <i>Citizen and Cooper</i>	Brentwood, Essex
Olga Romana Harper <i>Roger Alan Harper, MBE</i> <i>Judy Senta Tayler-Smith</i>	an Employment Judge, retired <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Upholder</i>	Portishead, Somerset
Thomas Hedley Fairfax Harwood <i>Deputy Thomas Sleigh</i> <i>Andrew Paul Mayer</i>	a Journalist and Political Commentator <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	Vauxhall, London
Jennifer Ann Hastings <i>Ann Marie Blackburn</i> <i>Graham Williams</i>	a Headteacher, retired <i>Citizen and Apothecary</i> <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer</i>	Bromley, Kent
Mujibul Islam <i>Ald. Sir David Wootton, Kt.</i> <i>Ald. Vincent Keaveny</i>	a School Teacher <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Bromley-by-Bow, London
Ann Kenrick, OBE <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor Hilary Ann Russell</i>	The Master of the Charterhouse <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Charterhouse Square, City of London
Meher Taj Khan <i>Frederick Joseph Trowman</i> <i>David Robert Boston</i>	a Charity Worker (retired) <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	Barkingside, London
Richard Matthew Killmister <i>Ann-Marie Jeffreys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Technical Account Manager <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Farnborough, Hampshire
Jeremy Richard Bruce King, OBE <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Restaurant Group Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Westminster, London

Marcus Andrew Le Grice <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	an Investment Banker <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Putney, London
Hugo Richard Shaw <i>Ann-Marie Jeffreys</i> <i>Jeremy Christopher Charles Cross</i>	an Operations Director <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Insurer</i>	Brighton, Sussex
John James Moore St John <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Financial Advisor <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Hildenborough, Kent
Paul Dominic Vail <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	a Banker <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Wixoe, Suffolk
Lt. Col. Desiree Wineland <i>Teresa Wickham</i> <i>Richard Tufton</i>	a Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Farmer</i> <i>Citizen and Butcher</i>	Dallas, Texas, USA

This page is intentionally left blank

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, 7th October 2021

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

Statutory Instruments

Date in force

The Coronavirus Act 2020 (Residential Tenancies and Notices) (Amendment and Suspension) (England) Regulations 2021 No. 994

30 September 2021

In order to protect tenants during the pandemic, the Coronavirus Act 2020 provided that during the “relevant period” landlords are, in some circumstances, required to provide a longer period of notice of intention to claim possession of housing let under various specified types of tenancy. These Regulations extend the “relevant period” by amending the end date of 30th September 2021 to 25th March 2022. The Regulations also suspend the operation of some provisions of the Act, with the effect that the required periods of notice in respect of relevant tenancies revert, from 1st October 2021, to the pre-pandemic periods of notice, whilst the flexibility to impose longer periods of notice, if necessary, is retained until 25th March 2022.

The Alcohol Licensing (Coronavirus) (Regulatory Easements) (Amendment) Regulations 2021 No 1049

16 September 2021

These Regulations amend the Business and Planning Act 2020, which made temporary modifications to the Licensing Act 2003 in response to the Coronavirus pandemic. The modifications provide automatic extensions of premises licences that only permit sales of alcohol for consumption on the premises (“on-sales”) to allow sales of alcohol for consumption off the premises (“off-sales”). They also apply temporary conditions to licences where there is a pre-existing permission for off-sales, to enable those premises to operate in the same ways as those granted the new permission. These Regulations extend the end of the period of application of these modifications from 30 September 2021 to 30 September 2022.

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

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

By virtue of paragraph(s) 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank