

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 **13th day of January, 2022**.

This meeting will be a hybrid meeting and therefore will take place both virtually and in a physical location. Any views reached by the Court today will have to be considered by the Town Clerk after the meeting in accordance with the Court of Common Council's Covid Approval Procedure, who will make a formal decision having considered all relevant matters. This process reflects the current position in respect of the holding of formal Local Authority meetings and the Court of Common Council's decision of 15<sup>th</sup> April 2021 (and subsequently 16<sup>th</sup> December 2021) to continue with virtual meetings and take formal decisions through a delegation to the Town Clerk and other officers nominated by him after the informal meeting has taken place and the will of the Committee is known in open session. Details of all decisions taken under the Covid Approval Procedure will be available online via the City Corporation's webpages.

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

<https://youtu.be/XyikKFNFzAM>

A recording of the public meeting will be available via this link following the end of the public meeting for up to one municipal year. Please note: Online meeting recordings do not constitute the formal minutes of the meeting; minutes are written and are available on the City of London Corporation's website. Recordings may be edited, at the discretion of the proper officer, to remove any inappropriate material.

JOHN BARRADELL,  
*Town Clerk & Chief Executive.*

*Guildhall,  
Wednesday 5th January 2022*

Sir Alan Yarrow

David Graves

}

*Aldermen on the Rota*

# 2

## 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 Thursday 9 December 2021.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 7 - 32)

## 4 **Mayoral Visits**

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

## 5 **Policy Statement**

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

## 6 **Bill for Act of Common Council**

To:-

- Make Supplementary Arrangements for Presiding Officers at Wardmotes.

(First and Second Reading).

Together with a report of the Policy and Resources Committee thereon.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 33 - 38)

## 7 **Establishment Committee**

To consider the draft Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 39 - 54)

## 8 **Finance Committee**

To consider an extension to a sexual health e-services contract.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 55 - 58)

- 9 **Boards of Governors of the City of London School & City of London School for Girls**  
To consider amendments to the Terms of Reference of both the Boards of Governors of the City of London School and City of London School for Girls.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 59 - 66)
- 10 **The Freedom of the City**  
To consider a circulated list of applications for the Freedom of the City.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 67 - 70)
- 11 **Appointments**  
To consider the following appointments:
- (A) One Member on the **Community & Children's Services Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2022.
- Nominations received:-**  
Munsur Ali
- (B) One Member on the **Bridge House Estates Board**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2025.
- Nominations received:-**  
Jeremy Mayhew
- (C) One Member on the **Hospitality Working Party of the Policy & Resources Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2023.
- Nominations received:-**  
Michael Hudson
- (D) One Member on the **Board of Governors of the Museum of London** for a one-year term expiring in December 2022.
- Nominations received:-**  
Mark Bostock
- For Decision**
- 12 **Resolutions of Retirement, Congratulatory Resolutions.**  
To consider congratulatory resolutions in respect of retirements and the recent award of honours.
- For Decision**  
(Pages 71 - 72)

13 **Motions**(A) **By Susan Jane Pearson**

To consider a Motion, submitted by Susan Pearson, in relation to the use of City's Cash and housing-related projects.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 73 - 74)

14 **Questions**15 **Policy & Resources**

To note action taken under urgency procedures in relation to the reintroduction of Covid19 Protocol.

**For Information**  
(Pages 75 - 76)

16 **Ballot Results**

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

Where appropriate:-  
- denotes appointed.

One Member to the **Policy & Resources Committee**.

		<b>Votes</b>				
		<b>First Round</b>	<b>Second Round</b>	<b>Third Round</b>	<b>Fourth Round</b>	<b>Final Round</b>
Randall Anderson	-	9	10	12	17	-
Mary Durcan	-	33	34	34	35	43
John Fletcher	-	10	10	10	-	-
Paul Martinelli	-	15	17	18	22	28
Susan Pearson	-	5	5	-	-	-
James Tumbridge	-	4	-	-	-	-

*With no candidate obtaining 50% of the first preference votes, the candidate with fewest first preference votes was eliminated and next preference votes (as appropriate and where indicated) were transferred. This step was repeated for a second, third and fourth round.*

**For Information**

17 **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 77 - 78)

18 **Docquets for the Hospital Seal.**

19 **Awards and Prizes**

## **MOTION**

20 **By the Chief Commoner**

That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business below on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

**For Decision**

21 **Non-Public Minutes**

To agree the non-public minutes of the meeting of the Court held on 9 December 2021.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 79 - 86)

22 **Policy & Resources Committee and Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee**

To consider proposals put forward in response to the *Destination City* review.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 87 - 128)

23 **Finance Committee**

To consider proposals for the provision of water, wastewater and ancillary services.

**For Decision**  
(Pages 129 - 132)

24 **Bridge House Estates**

To note action taken under urgency procedures in relation to the purchase of a property.

**For Information**  
(Pages 133 - 134)

25 **Property Investment Board**

(A) **Report of Action Taken: Charterhouse Street**

To note action taken under urgency procedures in relation to the disposal of a lease.

**For Information**  
(Pages 135 - 136)

(B) **Report of Action Taken: Sale of Temple Chambers**

To note the action taken under urgency procedures in regard to the disposal of a lease.

**For Information**  
(Pages 137 - 138)



## KEAVENY, MAYOR

### LUDER, LOCUM TENENS (*ITEMS 17 – 27*)

## COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

9th December 2021  
MEMBERS PRESENT

### ALDERMEN

Professor Emma Edhem  
Sir Peter Estlin  
Sheriff Alison Gowman  
Prem Goyal  
Timothy Russell Hailes

Robert Charles Hughes-Penney  
The Rt Hon. The Lord Mayor Vincent Thomas  
Keaveny  
Alastair John Naisbitt King  
Ian David Luder

Sheriff Nicholas Stephen Leland Lyons  
Professor Michael Raymond Mainelli  
Sir Andrew Charles Parmley  
Sir David Hugh Wootton

### COMMONERS

Munsur Ali  
Rehana Banu Ameer  
Randall Keith Anderson  
Alexander Robertson Martin Barr  
Douglas Barrow  
Matthew Bell  
John Bennett  
Peter Gordon Bennett  
Keith David Forbes Bottomley,  
Deputy  
David John Bradshaw, Deputy  
Tijs Broeke  
Michael John Cassidy, Deputy  
Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick,  
Deputy  
John Douglas Chapman  
Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst  
Simon D'Olier Duckworth  
Peter Gerard Dunphy, Deputy

Mary Durcan  
John Ernest Edwards  
Anne Helen Fairweather  
Helen Lesley Fentimen  
Sophie Anne Fernandes  
John William Fletcher  
Marianne Bernadette Fredericks  
Caroline Wilma Haines  
Graeme Harrower  
Christopher Michael Hayward  
Christopher Hill  
Tom Hoffman, Deputy  
Ann Holmes  
Michael Hudson  
Wendy Hyde, Deputy  
Jamie Ingham Clark, Deputy  
Shravan Jashvantrai Joshi

Angus Knowles-Cutler  
Gregory Alfred Lawrence  
Tim Levene  
Natasha Maria Cabrera Lloyd-Owen  
Edward Lord, Deputy  
Paul Nicholas Martinelli  
Jeremy Mayhew OBE  
Catherine McGuinness, Deputy  
Andrew Stratton McMurtrie  
Wendy Mead  
Robert Allan Merrett, Deputy  
Andrien Gereith Dominic Meyers,  
Deputy  
Brian Desmond Francis Mooney,  
Deputy  
Alastair Michael Moss, Deputy  
Barbara Patricia Newman, Deputy  
Graham Packham  
Dhruv Patel

Susan Jane Pearson  
Judith Pleasance  
James Henry George Pollard,  
Deputy  
Jason Paul Pritchard  
Stephen Douglas Quilter  
Deputy Richard David Regan  
Elizabeth Rogula, Deputy  
James de Sausmarez  
John George Stewart Scott,  
Deputy  
Oliver Sells QC  
Jeremy Lewis Simons  
Sir Michael Snyder  
James Michael Douglas  
Thomson, Deputy  
John Tomlinson, Deputy  
Philip Woodhouse, Deputy  
Dawn Linsey Wright

1. Apologies      The apologies of those Members unable to attend this meeting of the Court were noted.
2. Declarations    There were no additional declarations.
3. Minutes        *Resolved* – That the Minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.
4. Mayoral Engagement  
s                    The Right Honourable the Lord Mayor reported on his recent engagements, including official visits to Spain and Portugal.

## 5. Policy Statement

The Policy Chair delivered a statement in which she made reference to the most recent Covid-related restrictions and their potential impacts on City businesses, as well as on internal City meetings and events. In response to a question from Tijs Broeke, concerning the significant effect on the hospitality sector, the Chair agreed that the Policy & Resources Committee should discuss the matter at its forthcoming meeting with a view to identifying how the City Corporation might assist in obtaining support for the sector.

## 6. Referral

**Referral to the Court of Common Council pursuant to Standing Order 9(4)(a): 115-123 Houndsditch, London EC3A 7BU**

On 16 November 2021, the Planning and Transportation Committee had agreed, by eleven votes to six, to grant planning permission for proposals for 115-123 Houndsditch – specifically, the demolition of existing buildings and construction of a new building comprising four basement levels (plus one basement mezzanine), ground floor plus 23 upper storeys, including office use (Class E), flexible retail/café use (Class E); community space (Sui Generis), ancillary basement cycle parking, servicing and plant; new public realm and highway works; and other works associated with the development.

Subsequently, the provisions of Standing Order No.9(4) were invoked. This involved 28 Members of the Court of Common Council requesting that the report of the Planning and Transportation Committee be referred to the Court. The terms of the referral were as follows: *"In accordance with Standing Order 9(4)(a), we the undersigned members give notice of the referral to the Court of Common Council, for decision at its meeting on 9 December 2021, of the report under agenda item 4 (115-123 Houndsditch, London EC3A 7BU) of the meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee on 16 November 2021."*

Deputy Edward Lord rose on a point of order, expressing their significant surprise that this matter had been referred to the Court and reflecting on the highly unusual nature of such a matter being called-in. They suggested that the drafting of this particular mechanism within Standing Orders had been designed to allow for consideration of matters of policy, rather than those of implementation, adding that the Court was an entirely inappropriate forum for the detailed discussion of planning applications. They made reference to the established governance framework and best practice in delegating such matters to planning committees which were trained in policy and protocol, adding that the City's Planning Committee had considered the item in detail and come to a determination. Given the Court lacked the benefit of the usual processes and protocols in place for the Planning and Transportation Committee, the Member expressed material concerns over the inappropriateness of such a matter being considered, as well as the significant reputational and legal risk, arguing that the referral constituted an abuse of process. They urged that the Court end the matter now and agree to move next business, pursuant to Standing Order No.11(9).

Graeme Harrower rose on a further point of order, suggesting that the Motion should be considered as being premature or an abuse of the rules of the Court, as detailed in the relevant Standing Order. The Lord Mayor disagreed with the suggestion, declaring that the Motion was valid and the view of the Court should now be sought.



Lord, C.E., O.B.E.,  
J.P., Deputy;  
Durcan, J.M.

*Motion* – That, pursuant to Standing Order No.11(9), the Court proceed to the next item of business.

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

A Division subsequently being demanded and granted, there appeared:-

*For the Affirmative – 56*

ALDERMEN

Edhem, Prof. E.  
Estlin, Sir Peter  
Gowman, A.J., Sheriff  
Goyal, P.B., O.B.E.

Hailes, T.R.  
Hughes-Penney, R.C.  
King, A.J.N.  
Lyons, N.S.L., Sheriff

Luder, I.D.  
Mainelli, Prof. M.R.  
Wootton, Sir David

COMMONERS

Ameer, R.B.  
Barr, A.R.M.  
  
Barrow, D.G.F., M.B.E.  
Bennett, J.A.  
Bennett, P.G.  
Bottomley, K.D.F., Deputy  
Broeke, T.  
Chadwick, R.A.H., O.B.E.,  
Deputy  
Duckworth, S.D., O.B.E., D.L.  
Dunphy, P.G., Deputy  
Durcan, J.M.  
Edwards, J.E.  
Fairweather, A.H.  
Fernandes, S.A.  
Haines, C.W.

Hayward, C.M.  
Hoffman, T. D.D., M.B.E.  
Deputy  
Hudson, M.  
Ingham Clark, J., Deputy  
Joshi, S.J.  
Knowles-Cutler, A.  
Lawrence, G.A.  
Levene, T.C.  
  
Lord, C.E., O.B.E., J.P., Deputy  
Martinelli, P.N.  
McGuinness, C.S., Deputy  
McMurtrie, A.S., J.P.  
Mead, W., O.B.E.  
Meyers, A.G.D., Deputy  
Mooney, B.D.F., Deputy

Moss, A.M., Deputy  
Packham, G.D.  
  
Patel, D., O.B.E.  
Pleasance, J.L.  
Pollard, J.H.G., Deputy  
Regan, R.D., O.B.E., Deputy  
Rogula, E., Deputy  
de Sausmarez, H.J.  
  
Scott, J.G.S., Deputy  
Sells, O.M., Q.C.  
Simons, J.L., O.B.E.  
Snyder, Sir Michael  
Thomson, J.M.D., Deputy  
Wright, D.L.  
Woodhouse, P.J., Deputy

Tellers for the affirmative – Jason Pritchard (negative) and Deputy Keith Bottomley (affirmative).

*For the Negative – 18*

COMMONERS

Ali, M.  
Anderson, R.K.  
Bell, M.L.  
Bradshaw, D.J., Deputy  
Chapman, J.D.  
Fentimen, H.L., O.B.E.

Fletcher, J.W.  
Fredericks, M.B.  
Harrower, G.G.  
Hill, C.  
Holmes, A.  
Lloyd-Owen, N.M.C.

Mayhew, J.P.  
Newman, B.P., C.B.E., Deputy  
Pearson, S.J.  
Pritchard, J.P.  
Quilter, S.D.  
Tomlinson, J., Deputy

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

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

*Resolved* – That the Court proceed to the next item of business.

## 7. **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)**

18 November 2021

### **(A) Governance Review: Committee Structure**

In late 2019, the City Corporation commissioned a comprehensive Governance Review. This was to be undertaken independently and Robert Rodgers, The Lord Lisvane, was appointed to conduct the Review. The Review's findings indicated that the Corporation's structures were too complex, with its decision-making too slow; questions of corporate endeavour were also raised.

In response to the Review, an informal engagement process had been undertaken, through which Members have been consulted extensively in relation to all the recommendations therein. Through the debate and consideration emerging, a number of immediate changes had already been made, such as the introduction of a new Standards Regime. This report now presented proposals emerging on the overall structure and business cycle for the committees of the Court of Common Council, for Members' consideration.

Introducing the report, the Chair summarised the importance of the changes and improving the efficiency of decision-making within the organisation. She also stressed that the proposals were intended to reflect the consensus position of the Court as a whole which had emerged through the process, balanced with the realities of implementation and packaging everything together into a single proposition.

With particular reference to the question of housing governance, and the proposals to establish a new Housing Committee, the Chair reflected on the broad support from Members for the proposals and direction of travel but recognised that there were some concerns about committing to anything at this stage absent the further detail, as referred to within the report, being developed. Following a very productive meeting with interested Members the day prior, she was minded that it would be best to hold off on these specific proposals until a more fully-formed proposition, consistent with the principles articulated in the report, was available. Consequently, she sought the Court's leave to amend the proposals before it, such as to withdraw the proposal for a new Housing Committee at this stage, with the effect of leaving the existing structures – i.e., the Barbican Residential Committee and Housing Sub-Committee – as they were until such time as detailed proposals were considered.

McGuinness,  
C.S., Deputy;  
Hayward, C.M.

*Amendment* – That the proposals within the report for a new Housing Committee be withdrawn.

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

The Court proceeded to debate the report as amended.

During the debate that ensued, Deputy Peter Dunphy spoke to highlight a number of proposed amendments he intended to move, the wording of which had been circulated and which he intended to propose in turn. He expressed the view that it was important to take the opportunity to gauge, formally, the mood of the Court on specific issues. He also highlighted the particular question of term limits and the views of the Court at its recent informal meeting in supporting their introduction, suggesting that this particularly merited a specific vote.

*Amendment – That the wording in the report at bullet 6 entitled ‘Term Limits’ (page 32; paragraph 8) be deleted and replaced with the following wording: “Term Limits – Members support the introduction of term limits for non-ward committees with maximum terms of 12 consecutive years applying. In relation to existing membership of committees no more than 4 years shall be counted towards existing service allowing for current members to serve at least a further 8 years on any committee to which they are currently elected. Members will be able to seek re-election to a committee after an absence of 4 years with new term limits applying.”*

Dunphy, P.G.,  
Deputy; Holmes,  
A.

During discussion of the proposed Amendment, a number of points arose:

- Reference was made to the system used when term limits were introduced to the Barbican Centre Board, whereby previous service had been divided by two and rounded down, in order to calculate remaining eligibility should term limits be introduced to committees across the board.
- Whilst expressing some sympathy with the concept of term limits in general, several Members queried their appropriateness for all committees and also highlighted the current requirement for regular re-election by the Court, which they felt generated a reasonable degree of turnover and left the Court as sovereign in each instance.
- A Member expressed concern around the specific wording of the proposed amendment and implications around how breaks in service would be treated.
- Whilst there were some differences of opinion as to the appropriate length of any term limits, several Members also articulated their strong support for their uniform introduction, observing the benefits from a diversity perspective which accrued through the enforced churn of membership.
- Other Members reflected on the negative perceptions associated with the extremely long service of some Members on some committees, as well as a tendency for incumbents seeking re-election to not be challenged.

Closing discussion on the Amendment, Deputy Peter Dunphy articulated his robust disagreement with the with suggestion that the current process of re-election by the Court was sufficient, arguing that it was a fundamentally different thing to term limits and served a different purpose. The Policy Chair, through her rebuttal, expressed concern that a number of points as to how the proposal would be implemented remained unclear and urged against it being supported. She added that there would be a Post-implementation Review which would be a more appropriate opportunity to look at this properly in due course, should it be the wish of Members.

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

Deputy Peter Dunphy proceeded to move a further Amendment, relating to the composition of the Community & Children’s Services, Culture Heritage & Libraries, and Port Health & Environmental Services Committees.

Dunphy, P.G.,  
Deputy; Holmes,  
A.

*Amendment – That:-*

- In respect of the Community & Children’s Services Committee, bullet 11 of paragraph 9 on page 34, the addition of the words *“To become an elected committee of 18 Members.”*
- In respect of the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee, bullet 13 of paragraph 9 on page 34, the words *“No change other than”* be deleted and replaced with the words *“To become an elected committee of 18 Members.”*
- In respect of the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee, bullet 30 of paragraph 9 on page 35, the deletion of the words *“No change”* and insertion of the words *“To become an elected committee of 18 Members.”*

Broeke, T.;  
Anderson, R.K.

*Motion – That, in accordance with Standing Order No.11(10), the Question be now put.*

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

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

Deputy Peter Dunphy proceeded to move a further Amendment, relating to the reduction in size of all non-Ward Committees.

Dunphy, P.G.,  
Deputy; Holmes,  
A.

*Amendment – That, on page 36, paragraph 13, bullet 3, the following sentences be deleted: “However, it was agreed that a “one size fits all” approach would not be appropriate and each case would need to be assessed on its merits. Consequently, it is proposed that each affected committee be asked to consider its composition with a view to reducing numbers. Such reductions could be arranged such that they achieved through natural wastage as vacancies occur each year, minimising disruption.”*

*And be replaced with the following wording: “Members were, in general, supportive of the recommendation to reduce all (non-Ward) Committees in size, noting the recommendation that they be 12-15. Consequently, it is proposed that each committee (without an otherwise determined size) be reduced in size to a maximum of 15 members within a period of 4 years. Such reductions could be arranged such that they achieved through natural wastage as vacancies occur each year, minimising disruption.”*

During discussion on this Amendment, concern was expressed that setting such a timescale would be premature given the lack of intention to reduce the number of Members on the Court, and might then result in some Members not being able to gain appointment to any committees. In closing debate, Deputy Peter Dunphy articulated his belief that making the decision to reduce size discretionary would be unlikely to result in any change and that action was needed from the Court to enforce this and act in the best interests of the Corporation’s overall governance

arrangements.

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

Deputy Peter Dunphy moved a final Amendment, concerning the status of the Planning & Transportation Committee. He urged that the Court not fetter its future discretion as to the prospective form or composition of a the Committee.

Dunphy, P.G.,  
Deputy; Holmes,  
A.

*Amendment* – That, in respect of the Planning & Transportation Committee, page 45; paragraph 46, the words “*and as a Ward Committee*” be deleted.

During debate on the Amendment, observation was made of the strong sentiments expressed by residents about this Committee in recent times, with it suggested that to remove Ward Committee status would indicate a lack of willingness to listen. Closing debate, Deputy Peter Dunphy clarified that this Amendment would not remove the option of retaining Ward Committee status; rather, it simply sought the ability for the Court to retain future discretion.

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

Debate then resumed on the substantive report, during which, a number of points were raised:

- Several Members spoke to express their disappointment at the insufficiently radical nature of the proposals, arguing that they should have been significantly more ambitious.
- In particular, there was commentary around the need for greater delegation to and empowerment of officers, the need for a robust reduction in committee sizes, the need for greater empowerment for institutional bodies, and the importance of dividing the Court’s business into distinct local authority, private, and charitable functions.
- The point was made that, whilst the proposals might not be as radical as some might wish for, they also went farther than others would like. As with any democratic process, compromise was essential and the realities and importance of achieving an acceptable solution to 125 Members needed to be considered.
- It was also argued that the proposals did mark a significant step forward and factored in opportunities for further changes and improvements as things became embedded.
- Several Members reflected on the timing of meetings, which had not been taken forward following soundings taken at the informal Court meeting, but which they felt changes to were essential in order to facilitate greater engagement from prospective candidates and the public.
- A number of Members also advanced support for the possibility of facilitating public engagement at Court meetings, perhaps through allowing an allocated item at which City residents, workers, students and so on could submit questions to leading Members. It was suggested that this practice was not uncommon elsewhere and might be facilitated through the review of Standing

Orders.

- A suggestion was also made that the number of Members should also be considered further, as there may be discrepancies between the allocation of Members amongst Wards and the in respect of the groups they were responsible for representing.

Closing the debate, the Chair reflected on the nature of the discussion and the complexities involved in obtaining consensus. She urged all Members to support the package of proposals before them, which represented significant change and improvement.

*Resolved – That:-*

1. The proposals made in relation to the Committee structure through the initial Review of the City Corporation's Governance be noted (Appendix 4).
2. The proposed responses to the initial Governance review recommendations, as summarised in Appendix 2 and detailed within the body of the report, be approved subject to the withdrawal of proposals relating to a new Housing Committee.
3. The proposed Committee Structure and amendments to governance processes as set out in the report be approved, subject to the withdrawal of proposals relating to a new Housing Committee.

### **(B) Scheme of Delegations**

The Policy and Resources Committee, being responsible for the co-ordination of the City Corporation's governance arrangements including the Scheme of Delegations (SoD), had proposed a number of changes, some of which supported the comprehensive work that was currently being undertaken in respect of the organisation's governance arrangements. Changes to includes relevant updates in legislation and corrects any drafting errors had also been proposed.

All Chief Officers had been asked to review their delegations and a number of new delegations had also been proposed to assist with day-to-day management. They also aimed to alleviate the demands on Members, address the issue of pace by increasing financial thresholds and reducing the need for proposals to be considered by multiple committees.

*Resolved – That:-*

1. Revisions made to the draft SoD be approved, as set out in the document.
2. Going forward, to ensure continued Member oversight, periodic reports of action taken be submitted to service committees in respect of the newly approved delegations.
3. To ensure good governance, the SoD be reviewed on annual basis.

8.

### **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE ESTABLISHMENT COMMITTEE**

**(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)**

**(Tracey Graham)**

18 November 2021

**Member / Officer Charter**

A Member/Officer Protocol had been adopted by the Court of Common Council in 2006 and was most recently reviewed and updated in April 2019. Since then, several factors had suggested that the existing Member/Officer Protocol required review and to be given a higher profile within the City Corporation's governance arrangements as soon as practicable.

Following a review of the existing Protocol and consideration by the Establishment and Policy & Resources Committee, the draft Member/Officer Charter was now presented the Court for consideration.

*Resolved* – That the proposed Member/Officer Charter be approved as set out in appendix one to the report.

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

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

**Applications for Hospitality**

**(a) Armed Forces Flag Day 2022**

It was proposed that the City Corporation hosts a flag-raising ceremony followed by light refreshments at Guildhall on the afternoon of Friday 24<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

Armed Forces Flag Day was established in 2009 to provide an opportunity to show support for members of the Armed Forces and service families, with the day forming part of a week of activity across the country to raise public awareness of the contribution made by the Armed Forces.

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

*Resolved* - That hospitality be granted for a flag-raising ceremony followed by light refreshments and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash within approved parameters.

**(b) London Tourism Awards 2022 Early Evening Reception**

It was proposed that the City Corporation hosts an evening reception following the 2022 London Tourism Awards Ceremony at Guildhall on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

London and Partners, as part of their work to promote London internationally, attract investment and support growth, manage the annual London Tourism Awards. The awards recognise the most successful and innovative businesses in the tourism sector in London.

The event would support the following Corporate Plan outcomes: to provide access to world-class heritage, culture and learning to people of all ages, abilities and backgrounds (outcome 3b); to cultivate excellence in academia, sport and creative performing arts (outcome 3d); and to promote the City, London and the UK as attractive and accessible places to live, learn, work and visit (outcome 8d).

*Resolved* - That hospitality be granted for an evening reception at the conclusion of the 2022 London Tourism Awards Ceremony and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Committee; the costs to be met from City's Cash within approved parameters.

**(c) Dinner to mark the first United Nations Plant Health Day**

It was proposed that the City Corporation hosts a dinner in the Livery Hall on Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2022 to mark the first United Nations Plant Health Day.

The United Nations General Assembly declared 2020 the International Year of Plant Health. The campaign aimed to raise global awareness on how protecting plant health can help end hunger, protect the environment and boost economic development. It has been proposed that each year 12<sup>th</sup> May will be recognised as International Day of Plant Health and, subject to formal endorsement by the UN General Assembly, 2022 was expected to be the first year that this is marked.

The event would support the following Corporate Plan outcomes: to create and transform buildings, streets and public spaces for people to admire and enjoy (outcome 10c); to provide thriving and biodiverse green spaces and urban habitats (outcome 11b); and to provide environmental stewardship and advocacy, in use of resources, emissions, conservation, greening, biodiversity and access to nature (outcome 11c).

*Resolved* - That hospitality be granted for a dinner and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Open Spaces and City Gardens Committee; the costs to be met from City's Cash within approved parameters.

**(d) Youth Interfaith Iftar**

It was proposed that the City Corporation host, in conjunction with the Naz Foundation, an Iftar at Tower Bridge on Tuesday 12th April 2022.

The Naz Foundation is a not-for-profit organisation that aims to promote excellence in education and positive integration into British society. In 2016 the Foundation organised the first interfaith Iftar event at Lambeth Palace. In 2019, the event was held at St Paul's Cathedral and Guildhall. The City Corporation agreed to support an interfaith Iftar in 2020 at the Tower of



London, but the event had to be cancelled because of the pandemic.

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

*Resolved* - That hospitality be granted for an Iftar following an interfaith group discussion at Tower Bridge and that arrangements be made under the auspices of the Hospitality Working Party; the costs to be met from City's Cash within approved parameters.

**(e) Report of Urgent Action Taken: Lunch to celebrate the 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the founding of UK Sport**

The Court noted that, in accordance with Standing Order No. 19, urgent authority had been sought to the City Corporation hosting a lunch in January 2022 to mark the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the foundation of UK Sport.

UK Sport was the government agency that supports Olympic and Paralympic sport in the UK and was an executive non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport.

Urgent approval was sought and granted to the City Corporation hosting a lunch in January 2022 to mark the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the foundation of UK Sport. The event would look to celebrate the achievements of UK Sport over the last 25 years and acknowledge the role it has played in improving elite sport in the UK as well as in advancing its reputation overseas.

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

**(f) Report of Urgent Action Taken: Early Evening reception for the Women of the Future Summit 2021**

The Court noted that, in accordance with Standing Order No. 19, urgent authority had been sought to the City Corporation hosting an early evening reception on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2021 on the eve of the Women of the Future Summit.

Women of the Future was a not-for-profit organisation which aimed to encourage a new generation of female leaders across business, media, culture and public service. The Summit provides a forum for current and future leaders and is the main event of the Women of the Future's annual programme. As in 2020, the Summit was to be held virtually owing to the global pandemic.

Urgent approval was sought and obtained to the City Corporation hosting an early evening reception on the eve of the Summit. This would enable Summit attendees based in London wanting to network in person an opportunity to be able to do so in advance of the virtual summit.

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

10. **LICENSING COMMITTEE**

**(Sophie Anne Fernandes)**

23 November 2021

**Statement of Licensing Policy**

The City of London Corporation, in its capacity as Licensing Authority, was required to publish its statutory Statement of Licensing Policy under the Licensing Act 2003 by the end of January 2022. It was felt that the existing Policy did not require a major overhaul and amendments had been made to cover legislative changes to the Licensing Act 2003 and to recognise the effects of the recent pandemic and how that was affecting, and may continue to affect, licensed premises.

The Policy had also been revised to include the effects on licensed premises of issues that were more prevalent today or issues where people's perceptions had changed and were more in the public eye than five years ago. These included steps to mitigate terrorist activity and steps that can be taken to assist vulnerable people.

Following a period of public consultation, the revised Policy was now presented for approval.

Introducing the report, the Chair commented that the foreword had been written in a positive tone prior to the most recent Government announcements around Covid-related restrictions. Whilst she held every hope that things would move forward in this positive vein afterwards, she took the opportunity to urge continued support for the City's hospitality businesses and echoed the plea made earlier in the meeting for further support for the hospitality sector.

*Resolved* – That the revised Statement of Licensing Policy, as set out at Appendix 1, be approved for adoption.

11. **BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES BOARD**

**(Deputy Dr Robert Giles Evelyn Shilson)**

**(A) Bridge House Estates Target Operating Model Proposal – Phase 1: Leadership Team**

The Court considered proposals relating to the organisational re-design of Bridge House Estates ("BHE") (charity no. 1035628) by the City of London Corporation ("City Corporation") as corporate trustee, in line with the City Corporation's Target Operating Model ("TOM"). The report sets out matters for decision which would support the City Corporation, as trustee, in the effective administration and governance of BHE, consistent with its legal obligations as trustee to always act in the best interests of the charity.

Specifically, the report proposed the creation of two new roles within the proposed BHE Leadership structure. These were a new BHE Chief Operating Officer post,

and a new Chief Funding Officer post, following the deletion of the Grade H Deputy Director of City Bridge Trust post. As these posts were at Grade I or above, their creation was submitted to the Honourable Court for approval.

*Resolved* – That the Court of Common Council, considering it to be in the best interests of Bridge House Estates (Charity No. 1035628), approves the creation of a new BHE Chief Operating Officer post at Grade I and also approves the creation of a new Chief Funding Officer post at Grade I.

**(B) Bridge House Estates Annual Report and Financial Statements 2020/21**

The Court considered the draft Annual Report and Financial Statements for Bridge House Estates (BHE) for the year ended 31 March 2021. A designed version of the report would be published and submitted to the Charity Commission once the Annual Report and Financial Statements had been finalised and signed on behalf of the Trustee. The audit work in respect of these accounts had been substantially completed and the Audit Panel had met, with positive feedback presented to the Chamberlain. BDO LLP, the charity's external auditors, had advised that they intend to issue an unqualified opinion.

The Annual Report and Financial Statements 2020/21 had been scrutinised by the Bridge House Estates Board, the Audit & Risk Management Committee having first provided their comments for the Board's consideration consistent with their particular skills, knowledge, and experience. The BHE Board now recommended them to this Honourable Court for approval.

*Resolved* - That the Court of Common Council, on behalf of the City Corporation as Trustee of Bridge House Estates (Charity No. 1035628), approves the BHE Annual Report and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 March 2021, this being considered to be in the best interests of the charity.

12. Freedoms

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

<b>Richard Alfred Amos</b> <i>David Alfred Amos</i> <i>Philip Reginald Devaney Jeffery</i> <i>Morrish</i>	an Account Handler <i>Citizen and Environmental Cleaner</i> <i>Citizen and Environmental Cleaner</i>	Woodford Green, Essex
<b>Michael John Barratt, MBE</b> <i>Vincent Dignam</i> <i>John Paul Tobin</i>	a Development Impact Engineer <i>Citizen and Carman</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Woodford Green, Essex
<b>Frances Penelope Baskerville</b> <i>Captain Graham Maurice Pepper</i> <i>Captain John Richard Freestone, MNM</i>	a Secretary-General <i>Citizen and Master Mariner</i> <i>Citizen and Master Mariner</i>	Farnham, Surrey
<b>Paul Martin Beckett</b> <i>Alastair Michael Moss, Deputy</i>	a Chartered Town Planner <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i>	Brentwood, Essex

<i>Oliver Sells, QC</i>	<i>Citizen and Musician</i>	
<b>James Patrick Berry</b> <i>Ald. William Anthony Bowater Russell</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	an Investment Banker, retired <i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i> <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Northampton, Northants
<b>Simon Anthony Blake, OBE</b> <i>Mark Watson-Gandy</i> <i>James Alastair Christian Watson-Gandy</i>	a Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Whitechapel, London
<b>Benjamin Robert Hamond Broadbent</b> <i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i> <i>Brian David Francis Mooney, Deputy</i>	a Central Banker <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	South Kensington, London
<b>Tamara Katherine Burnell</b> <i>Deputy Andrien Meyers</i> <i>Shravan Joshi</i>	an Investment Manager <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i> <i>Citizen and Fueller</i>	Sutton, Surrey
<b>Chai Fook Chai</b> <i>Dr Sin Chai</i> <i>Sir Francis McWilliams, GBE</i>	a Web Developer <i>Citizen and Apothecary</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Aldgate, London
<b>Robert Chandler</b> <i>John Dominic Reid, OBE</i> <i>Vincent Dignam</i>	a Highways Special Events Officer <i>Citizen and Grocer</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Old Coulsdon, Surrey
<b>Nicolas Chatila</b> <i>Dr Mahmoud Saleh Barbir</i> <i>Farid Barakat</i>	a Company President <i>Citizen and Apothecary</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Monaco
<b>Francis Ikechukwu Chinegwundoh, MBE</b> <i>Deputy Andrien Meyers</i> <i>Vincent Dignam</i>	a Surgeon <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Redbridge, Wanstead
<b>Kevin Daniel Craig</b> <i>Tracey Graham, CC</i> <i>Alexander Barr, CC</i>	a Company Director <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i> <i>Citizen and Ironmonger</i>	Clapham, London
<b>John Henry Crawford</b> <i>Keith William Pledger</i> <i>Mary Leonie Pledger</i>	an Engineer, retired <i>Citizen and Feltmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Bushey, Hertfordshire
<b>Nicholas Paul Anthony De Wiggondene-Sheppard</b> <i>Deputy Keith David Forbes Bottomley</i> <i>Christopher Michael Hayward, CC</i>	a Lloyd's Insurance Broker <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Redhill, Surrey
<b>Lisa Frances Maria Dunn</b> <i>Ald. William Anthony Bowater Russell</i>	a Housemaid <i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i>	Clapham, London

<i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	<i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	
<b>Darren Sean Enright</b> <i>Donald Howard Coombe, MBE</i> <i>David Peter Coombe</i>	an Import Company Director <i>Citizen and Poulter</i> <i>Citizen and Poulter</i>	Gillingham, Kent
<b>Carlson Lincoln Disraeli George</b> <i>Edward Gradosielski, BEM</i> <i>Dr Iain Reid</i>	a Medical Representative, retired <i>Citizen and Wax Chandler</i> <i>Citizen and Ironmonger</i>	Essex
<b>Mark Jerzy Gradosielski</b> <i>Edward Gradosielski, BEM</i> <i>Richard Leslie Springford</i>	a Residential Lettings Manager <i>Citizen and Wax Chandler</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Nazeing, Essex
<b>Alistair McKenzie Hodgson</b> <i>Alan Leslie Warman</i> <i>Diane Irene Warman</i>	a Museum Curator, retired <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire
<b>Muzzammil Hussain</b> <i>Sir David Wootton, Kt., Ald.</i> <i>Deputy Brian David Francis Mooney</i>	an Ophthalmologist <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	Isle of Dogs, London
<b>Suwei Jiang</b> <i>Ald. Sir Charles Edward Beck Bowman</i> <i>Ald. William Anthony Bowater Russell</i>	a Partner in An Accountancy Firm <i>Citizen and Grocer</i> <i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i>	South Croydon, Surrey
<b>Thomas Michael Jordan</b> <i>Michael Woolston Jordan</i> <i>Ronald Douglas Mortlock Jordan</i>	a Musician <i>Citizen and Plaisterer</i> <i>Citizen and Plaisterer</i>	Great Bookham, Surrey
<b>Peter King</b> <i>Joyce Amelia Ford</i> <i>Stanley Liu</i>	a Fire Officer with London Fire Brigade, retired <i>Citizen and Glass Seller</i> <i>Citizen and Butcher</i>	Welling, Kent
<b>Samantha Helena Lagna-Fietta</b> <i>Edward Gradosielski, BEM</i> <i>Stephen William Burgess</i>	a Clothing Buyer <i>Citizen and Wax Chandler</i> <i>Citizen and Carman</i>	Roydon, Essex
<b>Daniel Eric Lillis</b> <i>Deputy Philip Woodhouse</i> <i>Michael Hudson, CC</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Grocer</i> <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer</i>	Esher, Surrey
<b>Sophie Linden</b> <i>Tijs Broeke, CC</i> <i>Deputy James Michael Douglas Thomson</i>	The Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Hackney, London
<b>John Ellison Lund</b> <i>John Sidney Victor Day</i>	a Property Company Director <i>Citizen and Pavior</i>	St Brelade, Jersey

<i>Spencer Brian Seaton</i>	<i>Citizen and Glass Seller</i>	
<b>Trevor John Machin</b> <i>Marianne Bernadette Fredericks, CC</i> <i>Sylvia Doreen Moys</i>	a Police Constable <i>Citizen and Baker</i> <i>Citizen and Chartered Secretary &amp; Administrator</i>	Milford On Sea, Hampshire
<b>Richard Patrick Mackelworth</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Ald. Sir David Wootton, Kt.</i>	a Social Worker <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i>	Maida Vale, London
<b>Riccardo Giovanni Marchini</b> <i>John Sidney Victor Day</i> <i>Spencer Brian Seaton</i>	a Company Director <i>Citizen and Pavior</i> <i>Citizen and Glass Seller</i>	Orpington, Kent
<b>Graham Christopher Spencer Mather, CBE</b> <i>Jeremy Paul Mayhew, CC</i> <i>Deputy Catherine Sidony McGuinness</i>	The President of the European Policy Forum <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Westminster, London
<b>Darragh Martin McCarthy</b> <i>Ald. Prof. Michael Raymond Mainelli</i> <i>Deputy Catherine Sidony McGuinness</i>	a Financial Services Company CEO <i>Citizen and World Trader</i> <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Belfast, Northern Ireland
<b>Gunter Heinz Werner Hans Nebel</b> <i>Cyrus Soleiman Poteratchi</i> <i>Kevin Joseph McNicholas</i>	a Specialist Physician <i>Citizen and Skinner</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	Graz, Austria
<b>Garrick Kar Chun Ngai</b> <i>Robert Andrews</i> <i>John A Welch</i>	a Marketing Executive <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Toronto, Ontario, Canada
<b>Jayesh Patel</b> <i>Ald. William Anthony Bowater Russell</i> <i>Hilary Ann Russell</i>	an Overseas Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i> <i>Citizen and Farmer</i>	Hackney, London
<b>William Henry Polston</b> <i>Vincent Dignam</i> <i>Emmanuelle Cohen</i>	a Company Director <i>Citizen and Carmen</i> <i>Citizen and Woolman</i>	South Woodham Ferrers, Essex
<b>Simon Julian Sebastian Qureshi</b> <i>Richard Leslie Springford</i> <i>Dr Iain Reid</i>	a Head of Information Technology <i>Citizen and Carman</i> <i>Citizen and Ironmonger</i>	Blackheath, London
<b>Andrew Howard Riley</b> <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Jeremy Christopher Charles Cross</i>	a Banker, retired <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Insurer</i>	Northwood, Middlesex
<b>Christina Louise Roffey</b>	a Director of Marketing,	Snowball, King City,

<i>Robert Andrews</i>	retired <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	Ontario, Canada
<i>John A Welch</i>	<i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	
<b>Kayne Sheppard</b> <i>Donald Howard Coombe, MBE David Peter Coombe</i>	an Underwriter <i>Citizen and Poulter Citizen and Poulter</i>	Tooting, London
<b>Matthew Andrew Steven Showan</b> <i>Philip Wood Terence Harragan</i>	a Civil Engineering Company Director <i>Citizen and Feltmaker Citizen and Feltmaker</i>	Witney, Oxfordshire
<b>Mr Stephen Wayne Smith</b> <i>John Leslie Barber, DL Ald. Alastair John Naisbitt King</i>	an Insurance Broker <i>Citizen and Blacksmith Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Godalming, Surrey
<b>Jonathan Lionel Spry</b> <i>Mark Sutherland Johnson Luke Savage</i>	an Insurance Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Woolman Citizen and Draper</i>	Bath, Somerset
<b>Ian Charles Steingaszner</b> <i>Robert Andrews John A Welch</i>	a Supplier Risk Manager <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	King City, Ontario, Canada
<b>Oliver Charles John Tabor</b> <i>David Harry Sean Padraig Belton</i>	a Magician and Stage Illusionist <i>Citizen and Stationer &amp; Newspaper Maker Citizen and Stationer and Newspaper Maker</i>	Rochford, Essex
<b>Christina Anita Thompson</b> <i>Deputy Andrien Meyers Anne Helen Fairweather, CC</i>	a Local Government Director of Finance <i>Citizen and Common Councillor Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	Tring, Hertfordshire
<b>Balamurugan Viswanathan</b> <i>Deputy Andrien Meyers Anne Helen Fairweather, CC</i>	a Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Common Councillor Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	St. John's Wood, London
<b>Christopher Alexander Warren</b> <i>Robert Andrews John A Welch</i>	a Policy Director <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Oakville, Ontario, Canada
<b>Nicholas Philip Mark Wood</b> <i>Philip Wood Terence Harragan</i>	a Portfolio Manager <i>Citizen and Feltmaker Citizen and Feltmaker</i>	Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire

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.

13.  
Appointments

The Court proceeded to make appointments to various committees and outside bodies:-

- (A) One Member on the **Policy & Resources Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2023.

**Nominations received:-**

Randall Keith Anderson  
Mary Durcan  
John William Fletcher  
Paul Nicholas Martinelli  
Susan Jane Pearson  
James Richard Tumbridge

Read.

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

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

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

- (B) One Member on the **Community & Children’s Services Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2022.

**Nominations received:-**

Jason Paul Pritchard

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Jason Pritchard to be appointed to the Community and Children’s Services Committee.

- (C) One Member on the **Establishment Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2024.

**Nominations received:-**

James Richard Tumbridge

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared James Tumbridge to be appointed to the Establishment Committee.



- (D) Four Members on the **Board of Governors of the Museum of London**, two for one-year terms expiring in December 2022 and two for four-year terms expiring in December 2025.

**Nominations received:-**

- \*Paul Nicholas Martinelli
- \*Judith Lindsay Pleasance
- \*Deputy John George Stewart Scott, J.P.

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Paul Martinelli, Judith Pleasance, and Deputy John Scott to be appointed to the Board of Governors of the Museum of London.

- (E) One Member on the **St Andrew Holborn and Stafford's Charity** for a four-year term expiring in December 2025.

**Nominations received:-**

- Paul Nicholas Martinelli

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Paul Martinelli to be appointed to the St Andrew Holborn and Stafford's Charity.

14. Vote of  
Thanks,  
Late Lord  
Mayor

*Resolved unanimously* – That the Members of this Honourable Court take great pleasure in expressing to:-

**WILLIAM ANTHONY BOWATER RUSSELL**

- Shilson, Dr.  
G.R.E., Deputy;  
Mooney, B.D.F.,  
Deputy

their sincere gratitude and appreciation for the distinguished manner in which he has carried out the role of Lord Mayor of the City of London during the past two years: the first Lord Mayor to serve a second term since 1861.

We are especially grateful to William for placing the recovery of the City at the heart of his Mayoral Theme, as the City strives to respond to the challenges arising from COVID-19. William has worked tirelessly, leading a dedicated "Re-opening campaign" to encourage people back to the Square Mile. He visited several hundred businesses, from banks and barbers, to pubs and sandwich shops, culminating in the festival of church bells. This saw William ringing the Great Paul bell at St Paul's Cathedral, which at 16½ long tons is the second largest bell in the UK and had not been rung for the past 20 years.

As a Haberdasher, it comes as no surprise that William threaded together numerous strands of work in his Mayoral Theme, Global UK - The New Future, interweaving the importance of growing global trade, strengthening innovation and promoting a rich cultural and creative economy. As part of this theme, he convened the Culture and Commerce taskforce, putting our world-leading cultural sector at

the heart of London's recovery, and he has been an ardent advocate for UK business and trade. Green Finance has been a significant theme within this, with the hugely successful Green Horizons Summit a particular success.

Conducting business and fulfilling the demands of being Lord Mayor necessitated innovation to deal with the challenges posed by COVID-19, with quick adaptation to virtual visits as international travel became untenable. From virtual visits to the Far East and South America, to physical visits to the Middle East and North America, the Lord Mayor has retained his enthusiasm and good humour throughout the many hours spent both travelling and while sitting in front of a screen meeting people across the world. That good humour at virtual meetings also includes his leadership of this Court, as the first Lord Mayor to preside over virtual meetings of the Common Council.

Throughout these two hectic and unusual years, in all his work, the Lord Mayor has received magnificent support from Hilary, the Lady Mayoress, and, as we move to the close of what we hope has been a memorable and special period for them both, this Honourable Court thanks William for all that he has done as Lord Mayor. In taking their leave of William, their 692nd Lord Mayor, Honourable Members send to him and Hilary – as well as Edward, Nicholas, Alistair, and Helena - our very best wishes for their future good health and happiness.

15. Motions      There were no Motions.

16. Questions      **Taxi Access on City Streets**

Deputy Barbara Newman asked a question of the Chair of the Planning & Transportation Committee, seeking an update on progress in respect of requests to allow taxis to operate more freely on City streets, as discussed at the Court's June 2021 meeting.

Responding, the Chair noted that the Transport Strategy, Climate Action Strategy and recovery plans set out an ambitious approach to giving more space and priority to people walking, enabling more people to cycle, improving road safety, and reducing traffic and associated carbon emissions and pollution. Achieving these ambitions could sometimes require changes to the routes available to motor vehicles, including taxis, although access for taxis and other motor vehicles would be retained on most streets. The Chair confirmed that, when making changes to streets, there was no blanket approach, with taxi access assessed on a case-by-case basis against the objectives of the project and the Transport Strategy.

The first phases of this pedestrian priority programme were focused on transitioning the remaining temporary COVID-19 interventions into experimental schemes, thereby allowing an understanding their benefits and disbenefits as more people returned to working in the City and any changes in work and travel habits became clearer. Currently, as part of this programme, there are three locations with restricted access for motor traffic to give more priority to pedestrians. These were Chancery Lane, Cheapside and Old Jewry. Following engagement with local Members and businesses over the summer and with the taxi trade, the initial proposals for Chancery Lane were now being amended to allow access for taxis at all times of the day, together with changes to arrangements for deliveries and

servicing and access to on-street parking. However, the point closure on Cheapside would remain as bus and cycle only for the experimental period and Old Jewry would also remain closed to traffic at the junction with Poultry.

Experimental Traffic Orders for the first phase of the Pedestrian Priority Programme would come into effect in early January, followed by a six-month period of consultation and monitoring of the impact of the proposals. The Chair assured Members that there would be continued engagement with local Members as part of the consultation process and any final decision as to the retention, modification or removal of measures would be informed by consultation feedback and data collected over the time the experiments were in place.

In response to a supplementary question from Deputy Barbara Newman, in which she expressed her disappointment at the changes being limited to Chancery Lane, the Chair agreed to meet further with her or any other interested Member and expressed his firm belief that all decisions made to date had been undertaken in a collaborative and constructive spirit.

Replying to a further supplementary question from Deputy Wendy Hyde, in which she raised concerns about the lack of taxis late at night and the impact on safety for women and vulnerable travellers, the Chair gave his assurance that safety was at forefront of thinking at each point, adding that he recognised the need to send out the message that taxis were welcome in the City and provided a valuable public service.

Alderman Tim Hailes expressed his disappointment with the current position and queried whether the Chair would make a commitment to would revert with substantive proposals relating to improved taxi access; specifically, to allow for proper access for licensed hackney carriages through and to major City thoroughfares and Bank Junction in particular. Responding, the Chair expressed his view that it would be undesirable to commit to a blanket policy, advocating instead for an informed review of each proposal on an iterative, case-by-case basis.

Sir Michael Snyder reminded the Chair of undertakings provided previously in respect of the redevelopment proposals at Bank Junction, particularly in relation to a review of the original consultation and fact-finding activities concerning taxi access. He observed that this appeared to be somewhat overdue and questioned whether proposals for review would be forthcoming. In response, the Chair advised that the Streets & Walkways Sub-Committee had been going through the proposals around Bank Junction in detail but that, given the uncertainties of the current situation associated with the pandemic, it would be precipitate to make firm proposals at this time. He reiterated that all considerations were being taken on an open-minded basis.

### **Road Danger Reduction**

Rehana Ameer asked a question of the Chair of the Planning and Transportation Committee through which she sought an update on progress with respect to the Road Danger Reduction priority schemes and measures to monitor and address City-wide collision issues to ensure the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and motor vehicle users.

In reply, the Chair expressed his view that making City streets safe for all users was a core part of his Committee's work and one of its main priorities. He outlined the Vision Zero approach employed which sought to ensure that no one was killed or seriously injured while travelling on City streets, consistent with the Mayor of London and Transport for London's ambitions across the capital's street and transport network.

The Chair made reference to the contents of the 5-year Road Danger Reduction and Active Travel Plan which, along with the Transport Strategy, set out the approach to reducing road danger and preventing fatal and serious collisions. He also referenced current projects and activities including at St Paul's Gyratory, the Pedestrian Priority Programme, and promoting the use of safer vehicles through fleet accreditation schemes and other industry standards. Close working with the City of London Police was employed to support their education, engagement and enforcement around speed, risky behaviours, and safer vehicles, and much work was also undertaken with TfL to support their safer streets projects.

The Chair added that the Road Danger Reduction Plan was currently under review, with the aim of adopting a revised plan in 2022 which would reflect and be balanced against the shape and strength of the City's post-Covid-19 recovery. As part of this review process, a City-wide collision analysis would identify priority locations for safer streets improvements and identify areas of focus for campaigns and activities to encourage safer behaviours, including enforcement by the City of London Police. The plan would then be updated on an annual basis and act as a supporting document to the Transport Strategy.

Thanking the Chair for his response, Rehana Ameer asked a supplementary question in which she sought a commitment for a data-driven periodical progress update to be made available to the Court, updating on the actions taken and the key milestones being achieved in reducing the number of road accidents across the Square Mile. The Chair made reference to the aforementioned collision analysis and annual review of the Road Danger Reduction Plan, which would provide this information, and agreed to arrange for this annual update to be circulated by email to all Members.

### **Support for Afghan Evacuees**

Deputy Edward Lord asked a question of the Deputy Chairman of the Community and Children's Services Committee, concerning the work being undertaken to support those Afghan evacuees being accommodated in the Square Mile.

Responding, the Deputy Chairman advised that officers were working in concert with government, health, voluntary and faith partners to provide comprehensive support, with work focusing on supporting the engagement with mainstream services and providing the dignity, agency and choice one would want for all our residents. Every household had been registered with GP services and health and wellbeing support services established, whilst school and nursery places for some 211 children up to the age of 16 had been secured. The adult education service was also providing a range of English and other classes, and there was a timetable of free activities for young people as well.

Alongside these efforts, the Corporation continued to engage with the Government to inform its plans for longer term resettlement, as it would be the provision of settled homes by the Government that would provide the best platform to secure the lasting benefits of new lives in the UK.

In response to a supplementary question from Marianne Fredericks concerning the availability of English lessons at a location close to the hotel, the Deputy Chair confirmed that these were being arranged in the new Community Centre.

Replying to a further supplementary question from John Fletcher, the Deputy Chair confirmed that regular contact with the evacuees was being maintained over the forthcoming holiday period and that a range of activities were being organised. Following a final supplementary question from Sophie Fernandes, he also confirmed cognisance of the need to ensure certain utilities were brought to the hotel, particularly for female evacuees, given there were sometimes limitations on being able to leave the hotel

### **Electoral Registration – Serviced Offices**

Ann Holmes asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee regarding business voter registration and whether any progress had been made to enable those working in serviced offices to be registered.

In response, the Chair clarified that the issue at the heart of this matter was the distinction between tenancies and licences and a business's ability to register voters. For the purposes of registering, a qualifying body must, in order to appoint voters, ordinarily occupy premises as owner or tenant. The law distinguished between a tenant of premises and a licensee, even though to a bystander the attributes, on a day-to-day basis, of the individual tenant or licensee may look similar. However, it was the case that a licensee, whether or not potentially a qualifying body, could not appoint persons as voters. Many of the new serviced office companies tended to operate on a licence basis, so those businesses based there could not register voters.

The Policy and Resources Committee had recently asked the Comptroller & City Solicitor to look into whether there was any room for manoeuvre on this issue and Counsel's Opinion was subsequently obtained. Unfortunately, Counsel had confirmed the position, i.e., any business operating from serviced offices as a licensee, could not register voters within the confines of current legislation which would allow us to facilitate the registration of such voters.

In response to supplementary questions from Ann Holmes, in which she sought clarity as to the process by which the Corporation might ensure candidates confirmed the grounds on which they were eligible to stand for election, and Michael Hudson, wherein he highlighted the importance of the substance of a lease or licence as a determining factor as to eligibility, the Chair suggested that these queries should be pursued with the Elections Office and Comptroller (with reference to the legal advice recently received).

In reply to a final supplementary question from Natasha Lloyd-Owen, in which she

expressed some concerns around the fairness of differentials in voting allocations under the current system and queried whether there might be a willingness to revisit changes to primary legislation, the Chair noted that the Policy & Resources Committee had only recently received Counsel's opinion and had not indicated a desire to pursue this, so it would not be appropriate for her to do so; however, she was certain that the comments made would be borne in mind for future discussions. The Chair also challenged the suggestion of a lack of fairness in the City's democratic processes, observing that all democratic systems had some drawbacks.

In closing, the Chair took the opportunity to encourage all eligible voters to register ahead of the deadline.

### **Locum Tenens**

The Town Clerk reported that the Lord Mayor now needed to depart the meeting in order to attend another official engagement. Accordingly, there was produced and laid in Court a Warrant, signed by the Right Honourable The Lord Mayor, appointing Alderman Ian Luder as Locum Tenens to transact all the business appertaining to the Office of Mayoralty of this City during his absence.

17. Resolutions There were no resolutions.

18. 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: -

#### **Bills**

#### **Date in force**

##### **Environment Act 2021**

9 November 2021

This wide-ranging Act provides for targets, plans and policies for improving the natural environment and includes several provisions on local authorities' powers and responsibilities. Local authorities, including the Common Council acting in that capacity, are required by the Act to produce a 'biodiversity report' every five years describing actions taken to conserve biodiversity and the impact of those actions. They must also describe in 'action plans' how they will exercise their functions to achieve and maintain air quality standards and objectives, and may identify 'air quality partners' to assist them in carrying out those functions.

#### **Statutory Instruments**

##### **The Non-Maintained Special Schools (England) and Independent School Standards (Amendment) Regulations 2021 No. 1124**

1 November 2021

The Independent School Standards require the Secretary of State to check and confirm the identity and right to work in the United Kingdom of individual proprietors of independent schools and of chairs of proprietor bodies. This applies to the three independent schools for which the Corporation is responsible. These Regulations ensure that these checks may be carried out by a third party at the behest of the Secretary of State.

**The National Security and Investment Act 2021 (Prescribed Form and Content of Notices and Validation Applications) Regulations 2021 No. 1272**

4 January 2022

The National Security and Investment Act 2021 provides for persons to notify the Secretary of State about acquisitions that constitute 'trigger events' (i.e. that might raise national security concerns) and to apply for retrospective validation of a notifiable acquisition. These Regulations set out the information that must be provided to Secretary of State when submitting a mandatory notice, a validation application or a voluntary notice.

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

Read.

19. Hospital Seal There were no docquets to be sealed.
20. Awards & Prizes There was no report.
21. *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 Paragraphs 3 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.
- Mooney, B.D.F.,  
Deputy; Ingham  
Clark, R.J.,  
Deputy

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

22. Non-public Minutes *Resolved* – That the non-public minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.
23. **Bridge House Estates Board**  
The Court approved proposals relating to the disposal of a property.
24. **City of London Police Authority Board, Finance Committee**  
The Court approved proposals relating to the increase in contract value of a framework agreement.
25. **Finance Committee**  
The Court:-
- (A) Approved proposals relating to IT provision and associated contractual items.
  - (B) Noted action taken under urgency procedures relating to the award of a property insurance contract.
  - (C) Noted action taken under urgency procedures relative to the award of contracts concerning parking services.

26. **Property Investment Board**

The Court:-

(A) Noted action taken under urgency procedures concerning the surrender and regrant of long-term leases.

(B) Noted action taken under urgency procedures concerning the disposal of a property.

27. **Policy and Resources Committee**

The Court noted action taken under urgency procedures relating to the Markets Co-location Programme.

**The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and ended at 3.35 pm**

**BARRADELL.**



## Report – Policy and Resources Committee

### Supplementary arrangements for the Presiding Officer at a Wardmote – Bill for an Act of Common Council

*To be presented on Thursday, 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022*

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

#### **SUMMARY**

The accompanying Bill to this report is intended to introduce more flexibility into the arrangements for presiding at a wardmote, by allowing a Lord Mayor's Aldermanic Representative to preside where none of the traditional presiding officers are available.

Your Policy and Resources Committee has considered the matter and is minded that the proposed changes – which constitute a formalisation of pragmatic arrangements employed previously – should be progressed in advance of the City-wide elections in March 2022.

In order to effect the proposed change, a Bill for an Act of Common Council is required. In accordance with Standing Order No. 46, the terms of the Bill must be considered by the appropriate Committee(s) and be settled by the Recorder of London prior to its submission to the Court of Common Council for its first, second and third reading.

The draft Bill as set out in the appendix to this report has now been approved by the Policy and Resources Committee and has since been settled by the Recorder. It is, therefore, now presented to the Court for its first and second reading. Subject to the approval of the Court of the first and second reading, the Bill will be submitted to the next meeting of the Court for its third and final reading, thereby allowing it to be ratified in advance of the City-wide elections.

#### **RECOMMENDATION(s)**

Approval be given to:-

- Proposals to make supplementary arrangements for the presiding officer at a wardmote; and
- The draft Bill for an Act of Common Council to effect these changes, as set out in the Appendix to this report.

## **MAIN REPORT**

### **Background**

1. Traditionally, at an Aldermanic election, the Lord Mayor, or in their absence their locum tenens, acts as presiding officer.
2. At an election of Common Councilmen, the Alderman of the ward, or in their absence the Lord Mayor or their locum tenens, acts as presiding officer at the wardmote, and the Deputy of a ward can also preside at a wardmote to fill a casual vacancy.
3. When Members recently reviewed the Wardmote Book, they asked officers to look at these arrangements, to see if more flexibility could be introduced.

### **Current Position and Issues**

4. One issue is that there are many duties that the Lord Mayor is asked to undertake, both at home and abroad, and the number of senior Aldermen who have served as Lord Mayor and can act as locum tenens is quite limited. In any event it is not possible for the Lord Mayor and their locum tenens, or more than one locum tenens, to be present in the City at the same time and this limits the number of substitutions that can be put in place on the same day.
5. Whilst section 17(3) of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1954 enables a poll to be delayed to a different date in some circumstances, to allow the Lord Mayor to preside in multiple wards, it would be better in many cases to avoid any delay in the holding of a poll, for example where the ordinary ward elections in relation to the whole number of Common Councilmen are scheduled to be held on the same day.
6. Another concern that has been expressed by some Members is around potential conflicts when acting in the presiding officer role, for example, where an Alderman has supported a particular candidate for Common Council at the election in question. In this context it is important to note that, under section 2 of the City of London Ballot Act 1887, the presiding officer at an election where a poll is held is also the returning officer for that election, with all of the powers and duties which are conferred and imposed on that position.

### **Proposal**

7. Whilst the link between an Alderman and their ward is very important, and in most cases such engagement will not give rise to an actual conflict or perception of bias, there is clearly a desire amongst some Aldermen to have increased flexibility to recuse themselves in some circumstances, for example through an exchange of duties with an Alderman in another ward.
8. It is known that, occasionally, the customary arrangements set out above have been departed from in the past, out of necessity, but it is felt that any deviation ought to be formalised and regularised.

9. The initial proposal from Members was that a Representative Lord Mayor could be authorised to preside at ward elections. However, this must still be an Alderman who has passed the chair and so would not address all of the above concerns.
10. Allowing any Alderman to preside in a different ward would maximise the available options and is, accordingly, proposed. It is also proposed that such arrangements should continue to be exercised under the authority of the Lord Mayor, through the appointment in writing of a Lord Mayor's Aldermanic Representative to act as presiding officer at a specific election.
11. It may be worth emphasising that is not intended to routinely depart from the current arrangements – the option of a Lord Mayor's Aldermanic Representative would be used where none of the traditional presiding officers were available, and this is reflected in the drafting of clauses 2 and 3 in the Bill.
12. Should Members be supportive of the proposed change, a Bill for an Act of Common Council is required. In accordance with Standing Order No. 46, the Bill must be considered and approved by the appropriate Committee(s) and submitted to the Recorder of London for settling before it can be considered by the Court of Common Council for its first and second reading. A third and final reading at a subsequent meeting will also be required to complete the process.
13. Following approval by Policy and Resources Committee, the draft Bill has also been settled by the Recorder and it is now presented to the Court for its first and second reading. Subject to the approval of the Court, the draft Bill will then need be submitted to the next meeting of the Court for its third and final reading.

## **Conclusion**

14. Allowing for a Lord Mayor's Aldermanic Representative to act as Presiding Officer at any Ward election, where required, is considered a pragmatic and prudent measure to deal with potential logistical difficulties. Your Policy and Resources Committee commends it to you accordingly.

## **Appendices**

- Draft Bill for an Act of Common Council

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

DATED this 4<sup>th</sup> day of January 2022.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Deputy Catherine McGuinness**  
Chair, Policy and Resources Committee

**To be considered at the Court of Common Council**

**2022**

**A BILL**

For an Act of Common Council to –

Make supplementary arrangements for the presiding officer at a wardmote.

**WHEREAS:-**

- (1) From time immemorial there has existed and still exists in the City of London (“the City”) a Common Council consisting of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Commons in Common Council assembled and the Common Council have made, passed, ordained and established divers Acts, Ordinances, Rules, Orders and Regulations for the regulation and good government of the City and its Liberties as to them from time to time has been found necessary and expedient;
- (2) At the election of an Alderman the Lord Mayor, or in their absence their locum tenens, acts as presiding officer at the wardmote;
- (3) At the election of a Common Councilman, or Common Councilmen as the case may be, the Alderman of the ward, or in their absence the Lord Mayor or their locum tenens, acts as presiding officer at the wardmote, and the Deputy of a ward can also preside at a wardmote to fill a casual vacancy;
- (4) Under section 2 of the City of London Ballot Act 1887 the presiding officer at an election where a poll is held is also the returning officer for that election, with all of the powers and duties which are conferred and imposed on that position;
- (5) A number of Aldermen have expressed concerns about acting as presiding officer where they have supported a particular candidate for Common Councilman within their own ward;
- (6) It is not possible for the Lord Mayor and their locum tenens, or more than one locum tenens, to be present in the City at the same time and in addition the number of senior Aldermen who can act as Lord Mayor locum tenens is at present fairly limited and is likely to diminish further in the next few years;
- (7) Where by reason of the illness, absence or other incapacity of any Alderman the Lord Mayor is required to take a poll in more than one ward on the same day, each such poll shall be taken on such a day as the Lord Mayor may appoint, in accordance with section 17(3) of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1954, but it would be beneficial to avoid any delay in the holding of a poll, especially where the ordinary ward elections in relation to the whole number of Common Councilmen are scheduled to be held on the same day;

- (8) His late Majesty King Edward the Third by his Charter made and granted to the City in the fifteenth year of his reign afterwards confirmed and ratified by Parliament did (amongst other things) grant that if any customs in the City before that time obtained and used were in any part hard or defective or any things in the City newly arising in which no remedy had been ordained should need amendment the Mayor and Aldermen of the City and their successors with the assent of the Commonalty of the City might put and ordain thereto fit remedy as often as it should seem expedient to them so that such ordinance should be profitable to the King and to the citizens and to all other liege subjects resorting to the City and agreeable also to reason and good faith.

**BE IT THEREFORE and IT IS HEREBY ENACTED ORDAINED AND ESTABLISHED** by the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, the Right Worshipful the Aldermen and the Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled and the authority of the same **AS FOLLOWS:**

### **Interpretation**

1. In this Act –

“casual vacancy” means a vacancy in the office of Common Councilman arising from the death, disqualification or resignation of the incumbent;

“Lord Mayor’s Aldermanic Representative” means any Alderman appointed in writing by the Lord Mayor to act as presiding officer at the election in question.

### **Presiding Officer at the Election of an Alderman**

2. At the election of an Alderman a Lord Mayor’s Aldermanic Representative may act as presiding officer at the wardmote in the absence of the Lord Mayor and their locum tenens.

### **Presiding Officer at the Election of a Common Councilman or Common Councilmen**

3. At the election of a Common Councilman or Common Councilmen a Lord Mayor’s Aldermanic Representative may act as presiding officer at the wardmote in the absence of the Alderman of the ward, the Lord Mayor and their locum tenens, and also in the absence of the Deputy of the ward in the case of an election to fill a casual vacancy.

### **Commencement**

4. The provisions of this Act shall come into force on the day on which it is made and passed as an Act of Common Council.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Report – Establishment Committee

## Draft Pay Policy Statement 2022/23

*To be presented on Thursday, 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022*

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

### SUMMARY

The Localism Act 2011 requires the City of London Corporation to prepare and publish a Pay Policy Statement setting out its approach to pay for the most senior and junior members of staff. This must be agreed each year by the full Court of Common Council.

The Statement has now been updated for 2022/23 and has been considered and approved by your Establishment and Policy and Resources Committees. It is now recommended to the Court for approval.

### RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Court considers and agrees the draft Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23 as set out in the Appendix to this report to ensure that the City Corporation meets its requirements under the Localism Act 2011.

### MAIN REPORT

#### Background

1. The requirement for local authorities to produce Pay Policy Statements was introduced under section 38(1) of the Localism Act 2011 (the Act). This states that “A *relevant authority must prepare a pay policy statement for the financial year 2012-2013 and each subsequent financial year*”. In the City Corporation’s case, it is a “*relevant authority*” only in its capacity as a local authority. However, and in general, the City has not tried to distinguish in its Pay Policy Statements its local-authority capacities from any of its other undertakings, other than where these are specifically excluded from the remit of the 2011 Act.
2. The aim of the Act is that authorities should be open, transparent and accountable to local taxpayers, and this advice is repeated or expanded upon in various pieces of Government guidance, and a Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency, having statutory effect. The main themes of these are transparency, fairness and accountability. Pay Policy Statements should set out the authority’s approach to issues relating to the pay of its workforce, and in particular to the pay of its “Chief Officers” and the pay of its lowest paid employees.

3. Section 38 of the Act goes on to outline certain features which must be included within Pay Policy Statements.
  - Section 38(2) says that the Statements must set out the authority's policies for the financial year relating to the remuneration of its chief officers, the remuneration of its lowest-paid employees and the relationship between the remuneration of its chief officers and the remuneration of any other employees.
  - Section 38(3) says that the Statements must state the definition of "lowest-paid" employee adopted by the authority and its reasons for adopting that definition.
  - Section 38(4) says that the Statements must include the authority's policies relating to the level and elements of remuneration for each chief officer, remuneration of chief officers on recruitment, increases and additions to remuneration for each chief officer, the use of performance-related pay and bonuses for chief officers, the approach to the payment of chief officers when they cease to be employed and the publication of and access to information relating to chief officers' remuneration.
4. The definition of "Chief Officers" given in the Localism Act (under section 43(2)) is that of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and incorporates the latter Act's definitions of both "Chief Officers" and "Deputy Chief Officers". This is a much wider definition than the conventional definition of "Chief Officer" used in the City Corporation (generally denoting a head of department), and also wider than that which governs posts included in our Senior Management Group.
5. Under the Local Government and Housing Act, a "Chief Officer" is:
  - the authority's head of the paid service (the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, in the City Corporation's case),
  - any person who in general answers directly to the head of the paid service, and
  - any person (irrespective of whether they report directly to the head of the paid service) who in general is required to report directly to the authority itself or to any Committee or sub-Committee of the authority.

A "Deputy Chief Officer" under the Act is anyone who reports directly to any person defined as a Chief Officer.
6. The only employees who could be caught by any of these definitions who are excluded from them under the 1989 Act are those employees engaged principally in clerical or secretarial support, or who are responsible for other support services.
7. The 1989 Act applies to the City only in its capacities as a local authority, police authority and port health authority. However, in keeping with the commitment to wider transparency in our Pay Policy Statements, the basic definitions of "Chief Officer" and "Deputy Chief Officer" given in the 1989 Act have been applied in our Pay Policy Statements to all relevant employees of the City Corporation, irrespective of the capacity or capacities they work under, other than where their duties are specifically excluded from the provisions of the Localism Act.



8. The Localism Act makes supplementary provisions relating to Pay Policy Statements in its section 39. This says that the authority's Pay Policy Statement must be approved by a resolution of the authority by the 31 March before the financial year to which it relates, that the Statement may (again by resolution of the authority) be subsequently amended after the beginning of the financial year, and that, as soon as is reasonably practicable after its approval or amendment, the Statement must be published on the authority's website.
9. The general notion of the Act in relation to the Statements is that "*the Act's provisions will ensure that communities have access to the information they need to determine whether remuneration, particularly senior remuneration, is appropriate and commensurate with responsibility. In addition, the provisions will ensure that policies on the pay and reward of the most senior staff are set out clearly within the context of the pay of the wider workforce*".

### **Current Position - City of London Pay Policy Statement 2022/23**

10. A draft Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23 is attached. This was approved by your Establishment and Policy & Resources Committees in December 2021 and is now submitted for your consideration. It follows the format of last year's Statement, in that its main sections (after an introduction covering the legislative requirements in producing Statements) are now divided into a Policy Overview (Paragraphs 7-31), giving the background to policies relevant to the statutory requirements of Pay Policy Statements, and an account of Policy Implementation (Paragraphs 33-50), giving the current position of how such policies are implemented.
11. A version showing tracked changes from the 2021/22 Statement as approved by the Court in March 2021 is also attached, such that Members can see at a glance where changes have been made. These include where figures and other statistical information have been changed within various tables that appear in the Statement.
12. It should be noted that a Pay Policy Statement is not, as such, a "statement on pay policies", giving an account of all matters connected with remuneration in local authorities, but the putting into practice of a narrowly defined legislative requirement. The information presented by this statutory requirement has to be clear and accessible, and it is in keeping with that requirement to ensure that extraneous material is kept to a minimum.
13. In keeping with this, Pay Policy Statements are also meant to be an accurate account of current pay practices. These may change over the course of the year covered by the Statement, but it is not the job of the Statement to make predictions on this. Legislation allows Statements to be changed as policy or practice alters over the year, but until it does the Statement should reflect what is the current situation.

## **Conclusion**

14. To meet the requirements of the Localism Act, the City Corporation must agree and publish a Pay Policy Statement before each financial year. This report introduces for approval the draft Statement for 2022/23.

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

DATED this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December 2021.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Tracey Graham**  
Chair, Establishment Committee

Appendix 1 – Draft Policy Statement for 2022/23

Appendix 2 – Policy Statement for 2021/22 – with Track Changes indicating changes made for 2022/23 (please view [here](#))

**CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION**  
**PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2022-2023**

**LEGISLATIVE OVERVIEW**

1. Section 38(i) of the Localism Act 2011 (the Act) has required local authorities since the financial year 2012-2013 to produce a Pay Policy Statement in advance of each financial year. The Act requires local authorities to set out in their Statements their policies on a range of issues, particularly those relating to remuneration for their most senior and lowest-paid staff. This must include significant information on pay and reward for Chief Officers (as defined in the Local Government and Housing Act 1989). The Statement must be reviewed annually and agreed by “*a resolution of the authority*”, in the City of London Corporation’s case by the Court of Common Council. This document meets the requirements of the Act for the City of London Corporation for the financial year 2022-2023.
2. The provisions of the Act require that authorities are more open about their local policies and how local decisions are made. The Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency enshrines the principles of transparency and asks authorities to follow three principles when publishing data they hold: responding to public demand; releasing data in open formats available for re-use; and releasing data in a timely way. This includes data on senior salaries and the structure of the workforce.
3. The Act applies to the City of London Corporation only in its capacity as a local authority. It should be noted that not all of the pay and employment costs incurred by the City of London Corporation are carried out in this capacity, or even funded from public resources. As well as having statutory local authority functions, the Corporation undertakes other public functions, such as those of a police authority and of a port health authority. It also has private and charitable functions which receive funding through income from endowment and trust funds, and the pay and employment costs of these functions are met from these funds and are outside the scope of the Act.
4. In general, and in keeping with the spirit of openness, this Statement does not try to distinguish between information which applies to the City Corporation as a local authority and that which applies to it in any of its other capacities. However, insofar as the Act specifically excludes police authorities from its remit, this Statement does not include information about Police Officers.
5. Likewise, paragraph 7 of the Government Guidance for authorities on “*Openness and accountability in local pay*” (which has statutory effect under s40 of the Act for authorities in the preparation of their Pay Policy Statements) advises that “*The provisions in the Act do not apply to the staff of local authority schools and therefore teaching staff need not be brought within the scope of a pay policy statement*”. The City of London Corporation does not directly manage any local authority schools, but it does directly run three independent schools, and while some information about the remuneration of the teaching staff in these schools is provided in the Statement, in general the Statement follows the Government Guidance and leaves teaching staff outside of its scope.

6. The Act does not require authorities to publish specific numerical data on pay and reward in their Pay Policy Statement. However, information in this Statement should fit with any data on pay and reward which is published separately. The City Corporation operates consistent pay policies which are applied across all of its functions. Further details of the current Grade structures and associated pay scales are provided below in the section on "Policy Overview" (paragraphs 11-17) and "Policy Implementation" (paragraphs 32 and 36-43).

## **POLICY OVERVIEW**

### **Background and fundamental rationale**

7. All pay and terms and conditions of service are locally negotiated with the Corporation's recognised trade unions or staff representatives. In 2006-2007 extensive work was undertaken on a review of pay and grading structures. As a result, the principles set out in the guidance to the Act have already generally been addressed although the Act set out some additional requirements which are covered by this Statement.
8. In 2007, the Corporation implemented a number of core principles, via collective agreement, to form the City Corporation's pay strategy. This now focusses on a balance between incremental progression, individual performance and contribution to the success of the organisation. The main body of City Corporation employees are paid according to a Grade structure of 10 Grades (Grades A-J), with the most senior posts in a separate Senior Management Grade. Both the A-J Grades and the Senior Management Grade retain incremental progression, but this has since 2007 been determined by performance measured through appraisal over the year 1 April - 31 March. In 2020 and 2021, on account of the operational difficulties arising from the pandemic, this policy was waived for the year, such that failure to progress incrementally was by exception rather than through measured performance.
9. The provisions made in the 2007 pay review gave employees in Grades D-J and the Senior Management Grade access to "Contribution Payments" if the employees were at the top of their respective Grades. In years when these payments are in operation, achievement of them is also determined by appraisal over the same 1 April - 31 March time period. The payments are not contractual and are therefore made at the employer's discretion. In 2021, no Contribution Payments were made.
10. All incremental progressions are implemented from 1 October following the ending of the appraisal year, and Contribution Payments earned from appraisal are (when made) paid in the same October. In general, a fundamental element of the strategy is that achievement of payments related to performance is more onerous and exacting the more senior the member of staff.

### **Grading structure**

11. All non-teaching staff employed by the City Corporation below the Senior Management Grade are allocated to one of the 10 A-J Grades, other than in a small number of exceptional cases, such as Apprentices. All such posts were reviewed under Job Evaluation, ranked in order and allocated to a Grade following the 2007 Review. The

evaluation scheme was independently equalities-impact assessed to ensure that it was inherently fair and unbiased. New posts and any existing posts that change their levels of responsibility etc. continue to be evaluated and ranked under the scheme. The scheme, how it is applied, the scoring mechanism and how scores relate to Grades are published on the Corporation's Intranet, so staff can be assured that the process is fair and transparent. In addition, there is an appeal mechanism agreed with the recognised trade unions and staff representatives.

12. Grades A-C are the lowest Grades in the City of London Corporation. Grade A has 3 increments and Grades B and C have 6 increments, and progression through each Grade can be achieved by annual incremental progression, subject to satisfactory performance. There is no Contribution Pay assessment. However, employees at the top of these Grades have the opportunity if they have undertaken exceptional work to be considered for a Recognition Award, up to a maximum level set corporately each year (this has been £500 in each year since 2010).
13. Grades D-J have 4 'core' increments and 2 'contribution' increments. Progression through the 4 'core' increments is subject to satisfactory performance. Progression into and through the 2 'contribution' increments can require performance to be at a higher than satisfactory level. Once at the top of the scale, for those who achieve the highest standards of performance and contribution, it is possible (subject to the employer's discretion in any given year) to earn a one-off non-consolidated Contribution Payment of up to 6% of basic pay depending on the assessed level of contribution over the previous year. The appraisal system recognises four levels of performance - Improvement Required, Good, Very Good and Outstanding, and those employees at the top of Grades D-J who achieve either of the top two ratings can (in years when the system is authorised to operate) receive a Contribution Payment.
14. A separate performance-payment scheme is in place for a small group of employees at the Barbican Centre engaged in commercial activities. These staff may receive payments of up to £4,000 or £6,000 per annum, depending on Grades and their success in meeting certain performance targets. The staff involved are excluded from the Recognition Awards and Contribution Payments schemes applying to other employees on their Grades.
15. The Senior Management Grade comprises the most senior roles in the organisation, as determined by Job Evaluation. Posts on the Senior Management Grade (SMG) are those which are the professional lead for a significant area of City Corporation business, with the nature of the professional responsibility held being that the postholders are not only directing the function for which they are responsible towards meeting corporate strategic goals but are required to determine from their professional point of view how these corporate goals should be constructed. As the SMG posts are distinct roles, they are individually evaluated and assessed independently against the external market allowing each post to be allocated an individual salary range within the Grade, which incorporates market factors as well as corporate importance. Any increase in salary (whether through incremental progression or a cost-of-living award) is entirely dependent on each individual being subject to a rigorous process of assessment and evaluation, based on the contribution of the individual to the success of the organisation. SMG posts are not necessarily the best-paid in the organisation,

as other posts in Grades I and J may be better paid than some SMG posts, depending on the separate market supplements applied to the Graded posts.

16. Following approval by the Court of Common Council of a new Target Operating Model and Organisation Design, the Senior Management Grade will, from 1 April 2021, comprise the following posts:

- Town Clerk & Chief Executive
- Deputy Town Clerk & Chief Executive
- Chief Operating Officer
- Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer
- Comptroller & City Solicitor
- Remembrancer
- City Surveyor & Executive Director, Property
- Executive Director, Community & Children's Services
- Executive Director, Environment
- Executive Director, Innovation & Growth
- Executive Director, Human Resources
- Assistant Town Clerk & Executive Director, Governance & Members' Services
- Executive Director, Communications & External Affairs
- Chief Strategy Officer
- Executive Director & Private Secretary to the Lord Mayor
- Executive Director & Private Secretary to the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee
- Managing Director, Barbican Centre
- Managing Director, Bridge House Estates
- Principal, Guildhall School of Music & Drama
- Open Spaces Director

17. The Head Teachers of the City of London School, City of London School for Girls and City of London Freeman's School are not part of the Senior Management Grade for the purposes of pay (their pay is governed by a separate senior teaching pay scale, as outlined in paragraph 5). The pay of the post of Remembrancer is aligned to Senior Civil Service pay scales at Senior Civil Service Grade 3 (SCS 3)

18. Following the principles outlined above, the pay ranges for the Senior Management Grade were set with reference to both job evaluation and an independent external market assessment. The principles of this were agreed by the Court of Common Council in 2007 and, subsequently, the specific unique range for each senior management post was agreed by the Establishment Committee in October 2007, subject to alteration thereafter when the duties or responsibilities of posts or other external factors relevant to their pay and reward change.

#### **Other contractual payments**

19. In addition to basic salary, all Graded staff are paid a London Weighting allowance which varies depending on where they are based and whether they are supplied by

the employer with residential accommodation necessary for the purposes of fulfilling the duties of their job. This is to assist staff with the higher cost of living and working in London.

20. As most of the work of the organisation is undertaken in the City of London, there are some types of posts which are difficult to recruit to (e.g. lawyers, IT staff etc.). Accordingly, there is often the need to use market supplements to attract, recruit and retain highly sought-after skills. These, where used, can be applied to employees in Grades A-J. Any request for a market supplement must be supported by independent market data and is considered by a panel of senior officers and, where appropriate depending on the amount proposed to be paid and the Grade of the post, by the Establishment Committee. All market supplement payments are kept under regular review, and regular reports on payments made are produced for the Establishment Committee.
21. The London Living Wage (LLW) has been applied as a minimum rate for all directly employed staff, including Apprentices, since April 2017. Casual staff and agency workers have also been paid the London Living Wage since 2014. Until 2018, LLW increases were applied from 1 April each year in line with the most recently announced LLW increase. However, in October 2018, the City Corporation's Policy & Resources Committee agreed that LLW increases should be applied in this and future years to affected employees and other staff from the date of the increase's announcement, which in 2021 was on 15 November (an increase of 1.84%).
22. The Establishment Committee has specific authority to deal with or make recommendations to the Court of Common Council where appropriate on all matters relating to the employment of City of London Corporation employees where such matters are not specifically delegated to another Committee. These matters include the remuneration of senior officers. The Establishment Committee has delegated this to its Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee.

### **Transparency**

23. The Government guidance to the Act (which has statutory effect) requires the Pay Policy Statement to make reference to policies in relation to staff leaving the authority, senior staff moving posts within the public sector, senior staff recruitment, and re-employment of senior postholders who have left the authority, particularly in relation to arrangements which might be made in such an event that would appear to have the intention of minimising tax payments made by the re-engaged former employee.

### **Recruitment**

24. New staff, including those in the Senior Management Grade, are normally appointed to the bottom of the particular pay scale applicable for the post. If the existing salary falls within the pay scale for the post, the new employee is normally appointed to the lowest point on the scale which is higher than their existing salary provided this gives them a pay increase commensurate with the additional higher-level duties. In cases where the existing salary is higher than all points on the pay scale for the new role, the member of staff is normally appointed to the top of the pay scale for the role.

For posts where the salary is £100,000 or more, the following approvals will be required:

- (i) in respect of all new posts, the Court of Common Council;
- (ii) in respect of all existing posts, the Establishment Committee.

#### Payments on Ceasing Office

25. Staff who leave the City Corporation, including the Town Clerk & Chief Executive and staff on the Senior Management Grade, are not entitled to receive any payments from the authority, except in the case of redundancy or retirement as indicated below.

#### Retirement

26. Staff who contribute to the Local Government Pension Scheme who retire from age 55 onwards are able to elect to receive immediate payment of their pension benefits on a reduced basis in accordance with the Scheme.

27. Unreduced benefits are payable if retirement is from Normal Pension Age, with normal pension age linked to the State Pension Age from 1 April 2014, unless protections in the Pension Scheme allow for an earlier date. Early retirement, with immediate payment of pension benefits, is also possible under the Pension Scheme following dismissal on redundancy or business efficiency grounds from age 55 onwards and on grounds of permanent ill-health at any age.

28. Whilst the Local Government Pension Scheme allows applications for flexible retirement from staff aged 55 or over, where staff reduce their hours or Grade, it has in general been the City Corporation's policy to agree to these only where there are clear financial or operational advantages to the organisation. Benefits are payable in accordance with Regulation 27 of the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2013.

#### Redundancy

29. Staff who are made redundant are entitled to receive statutory redundancy pay as set out in legislation calculated on a week's pay (currently a maximum of £544 per week). The City Corporation currently bases the calculation on 1.5 x actual salary. This scheme may be amended from time to time subject to Member approval, and has most recently been so amended for staff made redundant on or after 25 October 2017. The authority's policy on discretionary compensation for relevant staff under the Local Government (Early Termination of Employment) (Discretionary Compensation) (England and Wales) Regulations 2006 is published on the Corporation's website.

#### Settlement of potential claims

30. Where a member of staff leaves the City Corporation's service in circumstances which would, or would be likely to, give rise to an action seeking redress through the courts from the organisation about the nature of the member of staff's departure from the Corporation's employment, such claims may be settled by way of a settlement agreement where it is in the City Corporation's interests to do so based on advice from the Comptroller & City Solicitor. The amount to be paid in any such instance may include an amount of compensation, which is appropriate in all the circumstances of the individual case. Should such a matter involve the departure of a member of staff



in the Senior Management Grade or the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, any such compensation payment will only be made following consultation with the Chairs of Policy & Resources and Establishment Committees and legal advice that it would be legal, proper and reasonable to pay it.

Payment in lieu of notice

31. In exceptional circumstances, where it suits service needs, payments in lieu of notice are made to staff on the termination of their contracts.

Re-employment

32. Applications for employment from staff who have retired or been made redundant from the City Corporation or another authority will be considered in accordance with the Corporation’s normal recruitment policy. The City Corporation does not engage former staff on contracts that enable tax payments to be minimised.

**POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AND CURRENT POSITION**

**Salary scales effective from 1 July 2021**

33. A three-year pay award giving an increase of 2.25% on Base salaries and 5% on London Weighting for all employees in Grades A-J and the Senior Management Grade was agreed in March 2020. The planned increases would be effective from 1 July each year between 2020 and 2022.. The agreement on the Pay Award included a clause for renegotiation “in exceptional circumstances”, and in December 2020, in the light of the circumstances caused by the pandemic, and of the Chancellor’s recommended “pay pause” for public-sector workers, the City Corporation invoked this clause. As a result of this, the pay award for 2021/22 was a 1.525% increase on Base salaries of Grades A-C and no increases on any other pay. The current salary scales are given below.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Min Salary (£)</b>	<b>Max Salary (£)</b>	<b>No. of employees</b>
Grade A	£16,650	£17,670	149
Grade B	£18,170	£21,110	554
Grade C	£23,730	£27,530	813
Grade D	£29,350	£34,040	699
Grade E	£34,040	£39,440	560
Grade F	£43,100	£49,980	414
Grade G	£51,460	£59,690	184
Grade H	£59,690	£69,170	88
Grade I	£69,170	£80,170	25
Grade J	£82,590	£95,760	17
Senior Management Grade (SMG)	£84,240	£258,970	17

The figures given are for Base pay only. Employee numbers are those at the time of the November 2021 pay roll. Any employee on Grades A-J who manages or supervises another employee on the same Grade has a separate pay scale paying up to 6.1% greater than the

salary on the substantive Grade. Any employee on Grades A-J who is in a residential post has a separate pay scale paying 12.5% less than the salary on the substantive Grade. The figures for employees in each Grade in the table above include those on the relevant supervisory and residential scales. All employees on Grades A-J and in the SMG also receive a London Weighting allowance. The allowance does not differ between Grades of staff.

Teacher Grades	£29,490	£60,250
Senior Teacher Grades	£64,640	£147,490

Figures for Teacher Grades exclude any additional responsibility allowances payable. Figures for Senior Teacher Grades include all payments.

This information is reviewed, updated and published on a regular basis in accordance with the guidance on data transparency and by the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011. It should be noted that all Police Officer pay scales are nationally determined and as such do not form part of the City Corporation's Pay Policy.

- 34. Current levels of London Weighting for non-residential staff are £6,710 for those based in inner London and £4,020 for those based in outer London. Separate rates (approximately 10% lower) are applied to residential staff.
- 35. The City Corporation subscribes to Croner's salary benchmarking. While this provides information on both public and private sector comparator jobs, general practice is to use the median level of comparator public-sector jobs in central London for organisations which employ between 1001 and 4000 staff, with a turnover of £50m-£100m as basis for establishing appropriate market rates.
- 36. The Act's provisions do not supersede the City Corporation's autonomy to make decisions on pay which are appropriate to local circumstances and deliver value for money for local taxpayers. The Corporation seek to be a fair employer and an employer of choice - recognising and rewarding the contributions of staff in an appropriate way. The Corporation set pay fairly within published scales and, in doing so, have regard to changing conditions in differing occupational and geographic labour markets.

**Employees below the Senior Management Grade**

- 37. The lowest Graded employees are in Grade A as determined by the outcomes of the Job Evaluation process. That Grade has been restructured in recent years such that its bottom and top points have risen higher up the pay scale. The current lowest point on Grade A is now £23,360, including a London Weighting allowance for working in Inner London. The current pay range for Grades A - J is £23,360 to £102,470 inclusive of Inner London Weighting of £6,710 for non-residential employees.
- 38. Under normal circumstances, in each October following the March end of the appraisal year, generally around two thirds of eligible employees have been allowed to move into the two higher contribution increments or to receive a one-off non-consolidated contribution payment. As stated earlier, in 2020 and 2021, normal practice was waived

as a result of the difficulties caused by the pandemic, and increments for eligible staff were allowed to be the default position.

**Senior Management Grade**

- 39. Current Senior Management salary scales are from £84,240 to £258,970, excluding London Weighting.
- 40. Each Senior Management Grade post is allocated a range around a datum point. There is a maximum and minimum (datum plus 9% and datum minus 6% respectively) above and below which no individual salary can fall. Where a pay increase for a member of staff would take them above the maximum in a given year, the excess amount above the maximum may be paid as a non-consolidated payment in that year. This does not form part of basic salary for the following year and will, therefore, have to be earned again by superior performance for it to be paid.
- 41. Each year the datum point advances by a percentage equivalent to any ‘cost of living’ pay award. Individual salaries would move according to the table below:

<b>Contribution Level</b>	<b>Salary Change</b>
A Outstanding	Datum % change + up to 6%
B Very Good	Datum % change + up to 4%
C Good	Datum % change
D Improvement Required	0.0%

- 42. As with staff in Grades D-J, normal practice on progression through Grades or Contribution Payments for eligible staff was waived in 2020 and 2021. In 2021, SMG staff not on the top of their Grades received a 3% “incremental” progression through their individual pay scales, but no Contribution Payments were made to those at the top of their scales.
- 43. The Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee sets the initial salary on appointment, together with the individual salary band, for staff with posts in the Senior Management Grade. Thereafter, the Town Clerk & Chief Executive determines annual salary progression for SMG posts (other than in relation to their own) within (and up to the maximum of) the existing individual salary bands and in accordance with relevant reward policies, in consultation with the Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee. Any changes to the individual salary bands for SMG posts must be agreed by the Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee.
- 44. In respect of the Town Clerk & Chief Executive, the post’s salary and any Contribution Payments that may be due to its holder are determined by the Senior Remuneration Sub-Committee. The Sub-Committee is advised by an Appraisal Panel comprising the Chairs of the Policy & Resources Committee (as the Town Clerk’s line manager), Establishment Committee, Finance Committee and General Purposes Committee of Aldermen. The Appraisal Panel set the Town Clerk’s annual objectives and review performance against those objectives, receiving a report from the Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee who conducts the annual appraisal meeting with the Town

Clerk. The Sub-Committee and Appraisal Panel are supported by the Director of Human Resources together with any appropriate external advisers.

45. Set out below are the broad pay ranges for the Senior Management Grade in 2020-2021, with the numbers in each band, excluding London Weighting. Each member of staff will have an individual salary scale within these broad ranges. (It should be noted that the figures below include the pay of employees who are acting up into two SMG posts which are currently vacant. A further SMG post is also vacant but there is not an employee acting up into it.)

£84,240 - £120,070	(4)
£121,260 - £152,110	(7)
£156,670 - £181,520	(7)
£223,370 - £258,970	(1)

### **Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers**

46. The Act specifies that information should be given in Pay Policy Statements about the determination of remuneration for Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers as defined under the Local Government & Housing Act 1989, including approaches to the award of other elements of remuneration including bonuses and performance-related pay as well as severance payments. This should include any policy to award additional fees paid to Chief Officers or Deputy Chief Officers for their local election duties. The 1989 Act applies to the City Corporation only in its capacities as a local authority, police authority and port health authority, but as with other parts of this Statement, details are given for all employees who would satisfy the basic definitions of Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers given in the 1989 Act, other than schoolteachers and those who work in general for the City Corporation in its capacity as a police authority.

47. According to the definitions given in the 1989 Act (but widened in their interpretation as described in the paragraph above), as of 19 November 2021, the City Corporation had 30 filled Chief Officer posts and 122 filled Deputy Chief Officer posts. The 30 Chief Officer posts comprised the 17 posts within the Senior Management Grade plus the following numbers of posts within the A-J Grades:

- Grade J 7
- Grade I 4
- Grade H 1

plus one post paid at a spot salary owing to the nature of its employment.

The 122 Deputy Chief Officer posts were made up of posts at the following Grades:

- Grade J 13
- Grade I 18
- Grade H 43
- Grade G 25
- Grade F 21

plus two posts paid at spot salaries owing to the nature of their employment and/or funding.

48. The distinctions between SMG pay and payments made to employees on other Grades are outlined in the relevant sections of this Statement above. The most significant element of pay able to be received by employees in Grades A-J that is not available to SMG posts is market supplements. 7 Chief Officers in Grades I-J receive these payments as do 53 Deputy Chief Officers in Grades F-J. 2 of the Deputy Chief Officers in Grade F receive additional payments for working contractual hours in addition to the standard 35 per week on most City Corporation contracts. One Deputy Chief Officer on Grade F receives occasional additional payments for participating in electoral activities. One Deputy Chief Officer (Grade J) receives additional payments for undertaking standby duties.

49. In cash terms, the payments per annum made to Chief Officers (including those in the SMG) and Deputy Chief Officers fall into the following broad pay bands:

<u>£ per annum</u>	<u>Chief Officers</u>	<u>Deputy Chief Officers</u>
40,000 – 50,000	-	18
51,000 – 60,000	1	25
61,000 – 70,000	-	24
71,000 – 80,000	2	15
81,000 – 90,000	4	13
91,000 – 100,000	-	12
101,000 – 110,000	4	6
111,000 – 120,000	4	3
121,000 – 140,000	5	5
141,000 – 160,000	4	-
161,000 – 199,000	5	-
<u>200,000 – 255,00</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>Total employees</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>122</u>

All payments outlined in the table above exclude London Weighting payments.

50. As mentioned earlier, the City Corporation is currently undertaking a significant review of its structure and services. This is due to be implemented this year, and it may have some effect on the numbers and the remuneration of Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers employed.

51. The schemes for incremental pay increases and Contribution Payments for employees in Grades D-J and the Senior Management Grade are set out in the relevant sections of this Statement above. These apply to Chief Officers and Deputy Chief Officers, depending on whether they are in one of the D-J Grades or the SMG. No Chief Officer or Deputy Chief Officer has an element of their basic pay “at risk” to be earned back each year. Progression through Grades is, however, subject to successful performance, assessed through the application of the performance-appraisal scheme. Contribution Payments for any Chief Officer or Deputy Chief Officer are only available

(when authorised) to those at the top of their Grades. These must also be earned through performance appraisal, and all such payments are non-consolidated, meaning that any recurrence of the payment has again to be earned through performance in future years.

52. The Act requires authorities to set out their policies on remuneration for their highest-paid staff alongside their policies towards their lowest-paid staff, and to explain what they think the relationship should be between the remuneration of their highest-paid staff and other staff. The City Corporation's pay multiple - the ratio between the highest paid and lowest paid permanent staff - is approximately 1:11. The ratio between the pay of the highest paid member of staff and the median earnings figure for all staff in the authority is approximately 1:7.

### **Publication of information relating to remuneration**

53. The City Corporation will publish details of positions with remuneration of £50,000 or above in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 and the Local Government Transparency Code issued by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

54. This Pay Policy Statement will be published on the Corporation's public website. It may be amended at any time during 2021-2022 by resolution of the Court of Common Council. Any amendments will also be published on the Corporation's public website.

55. This statement meets the requirements of the: Localism Act 2011; the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) guidance on "Openness and accountability in local pay: Guidance under section 40 of the Localism Act" (including any supplementary Guidance issued); "The Local Government Transparency Code 2015"; and the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015.

56. From 2018, the City of London Corporation is required under the Equality Act 2010 to publish information every year showing the pay gap between male and female employees. The organisation's most recent such report was published in March 2020, and showed a diminution in the mean and median hourly-rate gender pay gap and an increase in the proportion of women in the upper quartile of employees by pay rates.

T. Graham  
Chair, Establishment Committee

C. E. Lord, OBE JP  
Deputy Chair, Establishment Committee

November 2022

## Report – Finance Committee

# Extension to the contract for the provision of E-Services relating to the Pan London Sexual Health Transformation Programme.

*To be presented on Thursday, 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022*

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

### SUMMARY

1. The Court is asked to approve the recommended procurement strategy to extend the existing contract for the provision of E-Services relating to the Pan London Sexual Health Transformation Programme, with Preventx Ltd for three years at an additional value of c£50m. Court approval is required as the estimated contract value exceeds £4,000,000 as per Section 16.2 of the Procurement Code Part One. Your Procurement Sub-Committee and Finance Committee approved the contract award in November and December 2021 respectively.
2. It should be noted that the City is the Lead Authority of the Pan-London Programme (there are 30 participating authorities involved) so the City of London's actual net exposure to the cost of the three-year extension in respect of its residents is estimated at £75 - £100k.
3. The initial term of this contract ends on 14<sup>th</sup> August 2022, and a decision to extend this service is required. The contract contains provision to extend the contract, to a maximum of four years. The Corporation is obliged to serve notice to the supplier of an intention to extend the contract by February 14<sup>th</sup> 2022.
4. The extension is necessary because the participating authorities have decided to not initiate a procurement leading to a new award, and have recommended that the City, in its capacity as the Lead Authority, extend the contract as was envisaged at the outset. The authorities have also recommended that the City varies the contract extension period, from four extensions of a single year to an initial extension of 3 years with the option for a final extension of one year. For the avoidance of doubt, no change to the maximum term provided for under the contract is proposed.

### RECOMMENDATION

5. We recommend that the Court approves a variation to the contract in respect of the duration of the initial extension period, from one year to three years, with a subsequent option of a further extension of one year.

6. Furthermore, we recommend that the Court approves an extension of the contract for the provision of E-Services relating to the Pan London Sexual Health Transformation Programme.

## **MAIN REPORT**

### **Background**

7. London's Sexual Health E-Service is part of the Pan London Sexual Health Transformation Program (LSHTP) that aims "to manage and deliver an efficient virtual service as part of a wider healthcare system that responds effectively to the sexual and reproductive health needs of London's residents."
8. The contract for the provision of the e-service is valued at £204m. It was awarded to Preventx Ltd on August 15th, 2017, for a minimum 5-year term with options to extend by 1-year at a time for a maximum of 4-years.
9. The contract is delivered through a consortium of providers with Preventx Ltd being the lead provider, Chelsea and Westminster NHS Trust providing clinical care and Lloydsonlinedoctor providing medical treatment remotely.
10. A program team, hosted by the City of London Corporation, manages the contract on behalf of 30 participating authorities via inter-authority agreements. This includes the recharging local authorities for their residents' usage in a timely manner so that financial risk for the Corporation is managed. An E-Service Management Board (ESMB), comprising of representatives from each participating authority, provides strategic oversight for the contract.
11. The service has performed well against the key performance indicators and the supplier has been responsive to the need for individual authorities to control their expenditure or mitigate against capacity issues in their local clinics. Service user feedback is consistently positive, and the supplier has delivered service improvements at no additional cost.
12. When compared with providing similar care pathways in a traditional clinic setting, the e-service provides value for money to the participating authorities and convenience for their residents.

### **Options**

13. Approve an extension to the contract for the provision of E-Services relating to the Pan London Sexual Health Transformation Programme contract from 15th August 2022 to 14th August 2025 for an additional £50m.
14. Approve and extension to the contract of only one year, and not accept the recommendation of the authorities to vary the period of the initial extension by increasing it from one year to three years.
15. Not approve an extension to the contract.



## **Recommended Option**

16. Extending the contract by 3 years is recommended as this option fulfils our obligations to the participating authorities for whom we host the contract. There is significant risk for London's sexual health system if the Corporation does not implement the recommendation on behalf of the authorities.
17. The option of extending the contract by a single year is not recommended as the authorities have fully considered this option and concluded that their ambition for service developments, aligned to Integrated Care System will take time to develop, embed and evaluate.
18. The proposed strategy for extending this contract has been approved by a meeting of the DCCS Category Board 4th November 2021 chaired by Andrew Carter, Director of Community & Children's Services

## **Financial Implications**

19. The value of the monthly invoices from the supplier requires enhanced approval processes involving the City Treasurer and the Director of Community & Children's Services. The programme team includes a dedicated resource for recharging the partner authorities each month according to usage by their resident's usage. Regular meetings are held with Finance colleagues through the year to review the level of liquidity in the accounts and to agree any new measures to manage risk for the Corporation.

## **Risk Implications**

20. The e-service has demonstrated, through the pandemic, that it is a vital component of resilient sexual healthcare system for London.
21. If the extension of the current contract is not approved, as recommended by the related authorities, the ensuing uncertainty would create significant risk of major reputational damage for all authorities.
22. The City, as the Lead Authority, has made legally binding commitments to manage the contract according to the original procurement which included the option for contract extensions up to a maximum of 4 years.
23. If the extension periods remain as a single year, a secondary risk arises: The Supplier's investment in further development of the service is curtailed and the service does not develop in line with service user's high expectations.

## **Conclusion**

24. After consideration of the operating environment, our partner authorities have concluded that an extension to the current contract provides continuity and stability for our residents, key stakeholders, and financial planning.

25. An initial extension of 3 -years is preferred by our partner authorities to enable longer term service improvements related to the clinical model.

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

DATED this 7<sup>th</sup> day of December 2021.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Jamie Ingham Clark, Deputy**  
Chairman of the Finance Committee

# Report – Boards of Governors of the City of London School for Girls and the City of London School

## City Junior School Governance

*To be presented on Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022*

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

### SUMMARY

During the course of 2021, the Court of Common Council has received various reports relating to the establishment of a new City Junior School, operated as a joint endeavour by the City of London School and City of London School for Girls. Provision for a new joint sub-committee to oversee the administration of the Junior School was also made reference to through the Governance Review proposals approved by this Court.

At the meeting of your Boards of Governors of the City of London School and City of London School for Girls on 8 and 10 December 2021 respectively, the Boards agreed formally to the creation of a joint sub-committee to undertake the duties of the Board of Governors of the City Junior School and to make such revisions as required to the Terms of Reference of your Boards of Governors of the City of London School and City of London School for Girls so as to include oversight of the City Junior School. These recommendations were endorsed by your Policy and Resources Committee at its meeting on 16 December 2021.

Consequently, the Court of Common Council is now requested to agree minor revisions to both the Terms of Reference of the Boards of Governors of the City of London School and the City of London School for Girls, such as to include oversight of the City Junior School.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The Court of Common Council is **recommended** to agree the revised Terms of Reference of the Board of Governors of the City of London School and Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls to include oversight of the City Junior School.

### MAIN REPORT

#### Background

1. A co-educational junior school operated jointly by the City of London School and City of London School for Girls and acting as a feeder school for both senior schools, is due to open in September 2022. Finances have been agreed among various committees and the City Surveyor's Department has worked with the landlord at Gray's Inn to secure a lease on a former educational facility which is

available for long-term lease and for which the Heads of Terms have been approved by the Court of Common Council.

### **Current Position**

2. To date all significant decisions in relation to City Junior School have been made jointly by reporting separately to the Boards of Governors of the City of London School and the City of London School for Girls. This governance structure is onerous and unwieldy to support a fast-moving project. Furthermore, as City Junior School is expected to develop into a significant school with 300 pupils on its own site with a separate Department for Education (DfE) license and subject to Independent Schools Inspectorate (ISI) inspection in its own right from September 2022, a clear and accountable, independent governance structure will be required for City Junior School, albeit one which reflects the School's financial, operational and transitional links to the Boards of Governors of the City of London School and City of London School for Girls.

### **Proposal**

3. Following consultation with the Boards of Governors of the City of London School and the City of London School for Girls, the Town Clerk, Comptroller and City Solicitor, as well as in line with a previous decision of Policy and Resources Committee in June 2021, it was proposed that City Junior School's governance comprise a joint sub-committee of the Boards of Governors of the City of London School and the City of London School for Girls, to be designated as the Board of Governors of the City Junior School.
4. Made up of a majority of Common Councilors and complemented by a number of Co-opted Governors with additional skills, the sub-committee would essentially act as the Board of Governors in relation to School operations; however certain governance matters would be reserved for the Boards of Governors of the City of London School and City of London School for Girls including include matters relating to:
  - (i) City Junior School financial strategy and budget, which might have a material impact on the finances of the two senior schools;
  - (ii) Membership of the City Junior School Board of Governors; and,
  - (iii) Other matters which might have a significant impact on the two senior schools.
5. The proposed creation of a joint sub-committee is in line with the Governance Review proposals agreed by the Court, which made provision for a joint sub-committee and included a strategic target of limiting unnecessary growth in the number of grand committees.

### **Conclusion**

6. The Court of Common Council is recommended to agree the revised Terms of Reference of the Board of Governors of the City of London School and Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls to include oversight of the City

Junior School. The revised Terms of Reference have been endorsed by your Policy and Resources Committee and your Boards of Governors of the City of London School and City of London School for Girls.

**Appendix 1 – Proposed Revised Terms of Reference of the City of London School and City of London School for Girls.**

**Background Papers**

[City Junior School Governance Structure](#) – December 2021

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

DATED this 5<sup>th</sup> day of January 2022.

SIGNED by the Chairs

**Nicholas Michael Bensted-Smith, J.P.**

Chairman of the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls

**Tim Levene**

Chair of the Board of Governors of the City of London School

This page is intentionally left blank

**Terms of Reference for the Board of Governors of the City of London School**

**1. Constitution**

A Non-Ward Committee consisting of,

- one Alderman nominated by the Court of Aldermen
- up to 10 Commoners elected by the Court of Common Council at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment
- the following ex-officio Members:-
  - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London School for Girls
  - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London Freeman's School
- up to eight co-opted non-City of London Corporation Governors with experience relevant to the Board

The Chairman of the Board shall be elected from the City Corporation Members.

**2. Quorum**

The quorum consists of any five Common Council Governors.

Any decision taken by the Board of Governors shall require the agreement of a majority of Common Council Governors present at the meeting and voting.

**3. Membership (until July 2021)**

ALDERMEN

5 Vincent Thomas Keaveny

COMMONERS

Alexander Robertson Martin Barr

Keith David Forbes Bottomley, Deputy

Timothy Levene

Edward Lord, O.B.E., J.P., Deputy

Ian Christopher Norman Seaton

James Michael Douglas Thomson, Deputy

Marianne Bernadette Fredericks

Dominic Gerard Christian

(Caroline Wilma Haines)

together with:-

Lesley Cartmell  
Rosie Gill  
(John Claughton)  
Andrew Jones  
Ronel Lehmann  
(Lord Levene of Portsoken)  
Paul Madden  
  
Timi Dorgu  
*Vacancy*

together with four Members to be appointed this day and the ex-officio Members referred to in paragraph 1 above.

4. **Terms of Reference**

To be responsible for:-

- (a) all School matters;
- (b) the management of the School land and buildings belonging to the City of London Corporation;
- (c) the appointment of the Head and, where appropriate, the deputies and the Bursar; and
- (d) oversight of the policy, strategic and financial management of the City Junior School.



## **Terms of Reference for the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls**

### **1. Constitution**

A Non-Ward Committee consisting of,

- up to two Aldermen nominated by the Court of Aldermen
- up to 12 Commoners elected by the Court of Common Council at least one of whom shall have fewer than five years' service on the Court at the time of their appointment
- the following ex-officio Members:-
  - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London School
  - the Chairman of the Board of Governors of City of London Freeman's School
- up to six co-opted non-City of London Corporation Governors with experience relevant to the Board

The Chairman of the Board shall be elected from the City Corporation Members.

### **2. Quorum**

The quorum consists of any five Common Council Governors.

Any decision taken by the Board of Governors shall require the agreement of a majority of Common Council Governors present at the meeting and voting.

### **3. Membership (until July 2021)**

#### **ALDERMEN**

Robert Howard

Prem Goyal, O.B.E., J.P.

#### **COMMONERS**

Mary Durcan *for two years*

Clare James, Deputy

Dhruv Patel, O.B.E., *for three years*

Peter Gordon Bennett *for three years*

Mark Bostock *for three years*

Nicholas Michael Bensted-Smith, J.P.

Randall Keith Anderson

Tom Hoffman, M.B.E., Deputy

Rehana Banu Ameer

Shravan Jashvantrai Joshi

Richard David Regan, O.B.E., Deputy

together with :-

Prof. Anna Abulafia

Dr. Stephanie Ellington

Mary Ireland

Elizabeth Phillips

*Vacancy*

*Vacancy*

together with the ex-officio Members referred to in paragraph 1 above and four Members to be appointed this day.

**4. Terms of Reference**

To be responsible for:-

- (a) all School matters;
- (b) the management of the School land and buildings belonging to the City of London Corporation;
- (c) the appointment of the Head and, where appropriate, the deputies and the bursar; and
- (d) oversight of the policy, strategic and financial management of the City Junior School.



## List of Applications for the Freedom

*To be presented on Thursday, 13th January, 2022*

*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.

<b>Muhammad Arif Anis</b> <i>Frederick Joseph Trowman</i> <i>David Robert Boston</i>	an Author <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Gold and Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	Morden, Surrey
<b>Charles Jerome Caminada</b> <i>Martin Henry Charles Russell, TD</i> <i>John Woodruffe Eagle</i>	a Television Company Director <i>Citizen and Farrier</i> <i>Citizen and Shipwright</i>	Chelsea, London
<b>Daniel Stewart Reid Castle</b> <i>Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP</i> <i>Deputy Robert James Ingham Clark</i>	a Financial Services Marketing Director <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Weybridge, Surrey
<b>Dominic Cameron Clark</b> <i>Deputy Philip Woodhouse</i> <i>Michael Hudson, CC</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Grocer</i> <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer</i>	Leatherhead, Surrey
<b>Julia Anne Cleary</b> <i>Jonathan Martin Averns</i> <i>Jeremy Lewis Simons, CC</i>	a Local Government Officer <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and Scientific Instrument Maker</i>	Islington, London
<b>Arthur Keith Fitzroy Davis</b> <i>Daryl Newsome</i> <i>David Guyon</i>	a Printer <i>Citizen and Spectacle Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Plymouth, Devon
<b>Thomas James Foxtton</b> <i>Timothy Luke Fitzgerald-O'Connor</i> <i>Michael Gunston</i>	a Barrister <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	Southwark, London
<b>Duncan Garrett</b> <i>Donald Henry McGarr</i> <i>Colin David Hellyer</i>	a Computer Technology Engineer <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	Islington, London
<b>Ivo Eric Graziani</b> <i>Justin Giles Joseph Morin- Carpentier</i> <i>James Anthony Drabble</i>	a Chivalric Order Officer <i>Citizen and Tyler &amp; Bricklayer</i> <i>Citizen and Art Scholar</i>	Rome, Italy

<b>Flora May Hamilton</b> <i>Deputy Catherine Sidony McGuinness Dominic Gerard Christian, CC</i>	a Business Advocate <i>Citizen and Solicitor  Citizen and Insurer</i>	Camberwell, London
<b>Peter James Emory Horton</b> <i>Paul Malcolm Kennerley, RD  Peter Ian Dunbar</i>	a Hospitality Director <i>Citizen and Coachmaker &amp; Coach Harness Maker Citizen and Needlemaker</i>	Brixton, London
<b>Bo Jiao</b>  <i>Ald. Prof. Michael Raymond Mainelli Elisabeth Mainelli</i>	a Legal Executive and Business Manager <i>Citizen and World Trader  Citizen and Mason</i>	Southend On Sea, Essex
<b>Sujan Katuwal</b> <i>Frederick Joseph Trowman David Robert Boston</i>	a Restauranter <i>Citizen and Loriner Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer</i>	Charlton, London
<b>Iain Cameron Lochrie</b>  <i>Christopher James Caine Alan Robert Brumwell</i>	a Property Developer and Chief Executive Officer <i>Citizen and Maker of Playing Cards Citizen and Plumber</i>	Crewe, Cheshire
<b>John Derek Lunt</b> <i>Ann-Marie Jeffreys Christopher Michael Hayward, CC</i>	an Event Consultant <i>Citizen and Glover Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Surbiton, Surrey
<b>Nicola Katherine Lunt</b> <i>Ann-Marie Jeffreys Christopher Michael Hayward, CC</i>	a Teacher <i>Citizen and Glover Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Surbiton, Surrey
<b>Akaash Alexander Maximilien Maharaj</b> <i>Robert Andrews John A Welch</i>	a Global Organization Ambassador  <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Toronto, Ontario, Canada
<b>Anthony Roland John Martin</b>  <i>Deputy Philip Woodhouse Deputy Elizabeth Rogula</i>	a Transport Manager, retired  <i>Citizen and Grocer Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	Gloucester, Gloucestershire
<b>Sue Martin</b>  <i>Deputy Philip Woodhouse Deputy Elizabeth Rogula</i>	a Secretary, retired  <i>Citizen and Grocer Citizen and Common Councillor</i>	Gloucester, Gloucestershire
<b>Jerry James Nolan</b> <i>Malcolm Alastair Campbell Steven Leslie Batty</i>	a Private Hire Driver <i>Citizen and Woolman Citizen and Woolman</i>	St Albans, Hertfordshire
<b>Peter Allen Norton, GC</b> <i>Malcolm Alastair Craig Mark Sutherland Johnson</i>	a Defence & Security Consultant <i>Citizen and Gold &amp; Silver Wyre Drawer Citizen and Woolman</i>	Shrivenham, Oxfordshire
<b>David Charles Pinchin</b>  <i>Ald. Sir Charles Edward Beck Bowman The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i>	a Charity Chairman  <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Norwalk, Connecticut, United States of America

<p><b>Sarah Penelope Sinclair</b>  <i>Judy Senta Tayler-Smith</i>  <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i></p>	<p>a Livery Company Clerk  <i>Citizen and Upholder</i>  <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i></p>	<p>Seaford, East Sussex</p>
<p><b>Gurdeep Singh</b>  <i>Colin Trevor Gurnett</i>  <i>William Joseph Browning</i></p>	<p>an Automotive Technician  <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>  <i>Citizen and Glass Seller</i></p>	<p>Forest Gate, London</p>
<p><b>Oliver William Theobald</b>  <i>Barry John Frederick Theobald-Hicks</i>  <i>John James Tunesi of Liongam, The Younger</i></p>	<p>an Administrative Assistant  <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>    <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i></p>	<p>Burgess Hill, West Sussex</p>
<p><b>Jane Susan Vyse</b>  <i>John Anthony Hayton, TD</i>  <i>David Laxton</i></p>	<p>a Primary School Teacher, retired  <i>Citizen and Bowyer</i>  <i>Citizen and Bowyer</i></p>	<p>St Albans, Hertfordshire</p>
<p><b>Carl Jonathan Woodcroft</b>  <i>Kenneth William Endres</i>  <i>Alan Robert Brumwell</i></p>	<p>a Musician  <i>Citizen and Baker</i>  <i>Citizen and Plumber</i></p>	<p>Denham, Buckinghamshire</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

Congratulatory Resolutions –  
*by Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney*

*To be presented on Thursday, 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022*

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

**Motion:-**

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

**(i) Sir William Anthony Bowater Russell**, on his recent appointment by Her Majesty the Queen as a Knight Bachelor, in recognition of his services to financial innovation, culture, and wellbeing in the City of London, particularly during Covid-19.

**(ii) Jeremy Paul Mayhew, OBE**, on his recent appointment by Her Majesty the Queen as an Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, in recognition of his public and voluntary service.

**(iii) Sharon Marie McLaughlin, BEM**, on her recent award by Her Majesty the Queen of a British Empire Medal, in recognition of her services to community in the City of London.

This page is intentionally left blank



Motion –  
*by Susan Jane Pearson*

*To be presented on Thursday, 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022*

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

**Motion:-**

“That this Honourable Court resolves that the City Corporation explores the use of City’s Cash to fund the acceleration of the renovation of the housing estates which it owns both within and outside the boundaries of the City, so that it completes this renovation as expeditiously as it carries out non-residential projects like the Fleet Street “Justice Quarter”.

This Court accordingly further resolves that its relevant committees now be instructed to bring forward proposals establishing how this can be achieved, as soon as possible.”

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

*Susan Pearson (Mover)*  
Matthew Bell  
Mark Bostock  
Helen Fentimen  
Graeme Harrower  
Revd. Stephen Haines  
Christopher Hill

*Marianne Fredericks (Seconder)*  
Deputy Henry Jones  
Natasha Lloyd-Owen  
Deputy Barbara Newman  
William Pimlott  
Jason Pritchard  
Stephen Quilter

This page is intentionally left blank

# Report – Policy and Resources Committee

## Report of Urgent Action Taken: Audio-Visual Participation in Meetings and Re-introduction of Covid-19 Protocol

*To be presented on Thursday, 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022*

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

### **SUMMARY OF ACTION TAKEN**

1. The outbreak of COVID-19 brought the issue of virtual meetings to the forefront for all public bodies in responding to the various restrictions that were in place at the time. It resulted in a rapid move to virtual meetings in the UK with Government introducing temporary, emergency, measures (the *Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020*) enabling formal decision-making meetings to be undertaken virtually until 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021.
2. Virtual meetings allowed for flexibility, helped to facilitate greater public scrutiny and aided Members and officers in conducting business more efficiently and operated with a degree of success nationally while measures were in place. Notwithstanding this, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) decided not to extend measures beyond 6<sup>th</sup> May 2021 to enable local authority meetings to continue virtually or indeed enable the City Corporation to move towards a hybrid format as had been envisaged.
3. Part 5A of the Local Government Act 1972 covers public access to meetings, agendas and reports, the inspection of minutes and background papers, etc. and applies to the Common Council in its capacity as a local authority and police authority. Without the modifications introduced by the 2020 Regulations the legislation prohibits formal meetings taking place virtually. This means that in order to participate in discussions and vote on decisions or recommendations, Members must be present physically at the meeting at which the matter is considered. The legislative framework does not apply to informal meetings such as call-overs and working parties.
4. Court of Common Council agreed at its meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2021 to put in place a 'Covid' ratification process, i.e., holding an informal virtual meeting in the first instance to ascertain the general view of the Court or its committees, with the public being given access to the informal meeting to maintain transparency via live streaming and recording (with recordings retained for up to one year). A formal decision, which accurately reflected the mood of the informal meeting, could then be taken by the Town Clerk, or other officer nominated by him through delegated authority to formally approve such decisions pursuant to s.101(1) of the Local Government Act 1972.
5. In light of latest developments in the Covid-19 pandemic and the Omicron variant of concern seeing a significant increase in infections across London and nationally, a

number of Members had once again raised the issue of the City Corporation returning to informal meetings and the reintroduction of Covid-19 approval protocols to allow for these.

6. The Policy and Resources Committee subsequently considered the issue at its meeting on Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> December 2021 and agreed that the protocol should be re-instituted with immediate effect, with authority delegated to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to take a decision as to a suitable end-point (bearing in mind the Covid-related situation and how it progressed). It was also clarified that meetings would be operated on a hybrid basis, to allow Members to dial in from Guildhall should they so wish; however, there was to be no expectation of officer attendance.
7. Court of Common Council was not due to meet again until 13 January 2022. In order to give effect to any decision as quickly as possible, approval was sought and obtained under Court of Common Council urgency procedures that:-
  - i. It be agreed that formal local and police authority business be dealt with via the "Covid" ratification process, on the same basis as approved by the Court in April 2021 (i.e., by holding an informal virtual meeting in the first instance to ascertain the general view of the Court or its committees, with the public being given access to the informal meeting to maintain transparency via live streaming and recording. A formal decision, which accurately reflects the mood of the informal meeting, can then be taken by the Town Clerk, or other officer nominated by him, who is hereby given delegated authority to formally approve such decisions pursuant to s.101(1) of the Local Government Act 1972.)
  - ii. The arrangements to be implemented with effect from 00.01am on 17 December 2021.
  - iii. That authority be delegated to the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chairman, to take decision as to a suitable end-point (bearing in mind the Covid-related situation and how it progresses).
  - iv. The Town Clerk be authorised to make such amendments to Standing Orders and related corporate governance documentation as is required to give effect to the above decisions.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

8. We **recommend** that the action taken be noted.

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

DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of December 2021.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

**Deputy Catherine McGuinness**  
Chair, Policy & Resources Committee

## Report – City Remembrancer

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

*To be presented on 13<sup>th</sup> January 2022*

*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 Coroners (Inquests) (Amendment) Rules 2021 No. 1379**

12th January 2022

This statutory instrument amends the standard form for recording an inquest into a death under the Coroners and Justice Act 2009. The amendment reflects a recent decision of the Supreme Court, which confirmed that the civil rather than criminal standard of proof is required for the short form conclusions of “unlawful killing” and “suicide”. This affects the services of the City of London Coroner’s Court and the work of the Senior Coroner and two Assistant Coroners, who are appointed by the Corporation to investigate reported deaths within the Square Mile.

#### **The National Security and Investment Act 2021 (Commencement No. 2 and Transitional and Saving Provision) Regulations 2021 No. 1465**

4th January 2022

These Regulations bring into force all provisions of the National Security and Investment Act 2021 that are not already in force. The Act provides for persons to notify the Secretary of State about acquisitions that constitute ‘trigger events’ (i.e. that might raise national security concerns) and to apply for retrospective validation of a notifiable acquisition. The Regulations also make transitional and saving provision.

#### **The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Wearing of Face Coverings) (England) Regulations 2021 No. 1340**

30th November  
2021

These Regulations list places where members of the public are required to wear face coverings, other than in certain limited cases. They also require businesses in places where wearing a face covering is required to display notices giving information about that requirement, and prohibit persons carrying on business in specified locations from preventing anyone from wearing a face covering, except in limited circumstances. The effects of these Regulations were due to cease on 20th December 2021 but the application of the provisions has been extended by subsequent Regulations, as detailed below.

**The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Wearing of Face Coverings) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2021 No. 1400**

10th December  
2021

These Regulations amend the Coronavirus Regulations concerning face coverings. They add to the list of places where face coverings must be worn, provide for gatherings where face coverings need not be worn and clarify which persons are potentially liable to prosecution for an offence in relation to contraventions of the Regulations. They extend the period during which the above Regulations are in force until 26th January 2022.

**The Health Protection (Coronavirus, Restrictions) (Entry to Venues and Events) (England) Regulations 2021 No. 1416**

14th December  
2021

These Regulations impose obligations on those responsible for organising certain events, or managing venues including indoor music venues, exhibition halls, conference centres and other public halls, on occasions when such venues are attended by at least 500 people. In calculating the number of attendees, no account is taken of people who have assigned seats or who are providing services at the event. Organisers must take reasonable measures to ensure that they do not admit any person to such events unless the person has been fully vaccinated or has tested negative for coronavirus within the last 48 hours. Exceptions exist, for example for those under 18 years of age and those who should not be vaccinated for clinical reasons. Further exceptions apply to certain people attending the venue or event as part of their official duties, including diplomats, officers of an international organisation, and local authority officers. The restrictions are due to expire on 26th January 2022.

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

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) 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank



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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

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