

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 **9th day of October, 2025**.

Members of the public can observe the public part of this meeting by visiting
[The City of London Corporation YouTube Channel](#)

IAN THOMAS CBE,
Town Clerk & Chief Executive.

*Guildhall,
Wednesday 1st October 2025*

Alexander Barr

Michael Mainelli

}

Aldermen on the Rota

1 **Apologies**

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

3 **Minutes**

To agree the minutes of the meeting of the Court of Common Council held on 11 September 2025.

For Decision
(Pages 7 - 28)

4 **Election of Chief Commoner**

To elect a Chief Commoner for 2026/27.

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

- Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP
- Philip Woodhouse

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

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

For Decision
(Pages 29 - 30)

5 **Vote of thanks to the Lord Mayor**

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

6 **Letter**

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

7 **Mayoral Engagements**

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

8 **Policy Statement**

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

9 **Appointments**

To consider the following appointments:

- (A) One Member on the **Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School**, for a three-year term expiring in July 2028.
(No contest)
Nominations received:-
Tessa Marchington
- (B) Eight Members on the **Housing Governance Working Party**.
(Contest)
Nominations received:-
Matthew Bell
Nick Bensted-Smith
Deputy John Fletcher
Mercy Haggerty
Stephen Hodgson
Adam Hogg
Sandra Jenner
Charles Edward Lord
James Tumbridge
Jacqui Webster
Mark Wheatley
Deputy Ceri Wilkins
- (C) Two Members on the **Board of Governors of the London Museum**, for four-year terms expiring in December 2029.
(No contest)
Nominations received:-
Alderman Gregory Jones
Deputy Paul Martinelli

For Decision

10 **Policy and Resources Committee****(A) Scheme of Delegations – Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation**

To consider proposed changes to the Officer Scheme of Delegations.

For Decision
(Pages 31 - 46)

(B) Investment Property Governance Update

To consider proposed changes to the Standing Orders.

For Decision
(Pages 47 - 50)

(C) Panel of Independent Persons Report

To note the activities undertaken by the Panel of Independent Persons since May 2024.

For Information
(Pages 51 - 60)

11 **Finance Committee**

To consider proposals relating to a Central London Forward programme.

For Decision
(Pages 61 - 66)

12 **The Freedom of the City**

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

For Decision
(Pages 67 - 72)

13 **Motions****(A) by Deputy Ann Holmes**

“That Matthew Bell be appointed to the Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee for the Ward of Farringdon Within, in the room of Florence Keelson-Anfu.”

For Decision

(B) by Deputy John Edwards

“That David Williams be appointed to Planning & Transportation Committee for the Ward of Farringdon Within, in the room of Matthew Bell.”

For Decision

(C) by Deputy Henry Colthurst

“That the Ward of Lime Street twin its representation on Planning & Transportation Committee with the Ward of Langbourn following Anthony Fitzpatrick’s resignation from the Committee.”

For Decision

(D) by Leyla Boulton

To consider a Motion submitted under Standing Order 12(2), concerning the introduction of Rolling Registration at the City of London Corporation.

For Decision
(Pages 73 - 74)

14 **Questions**

15 **Legislation**

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

For Information
(Pages 75 - 76)

16 **Ballot Results**17 **Resolutions on Retirements, Congratulatory Resolutions, Memorials**18 **Awards and Prizes**19 **Docquets for the Hospital Seal****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 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972; or, they relate to functions of the Court of Common Council that are not subject to the provisions of Part VA and 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 11 September 2025.

For Decision
(Pages 77 - 78)

22 **Corporate Services Committee**

To consider a Gateway 4b report concerning the 'Ambition 25: My Contribution, My Reward' Project.

For Decision
(Pages 79 - 94)

23 **Finance Committee****(A) Continuation of Waste Management Service Contract**

To consider proposals relating to a Waste Management Service Contract.

For Decision
(Pages 95 - 100)

(B) Extension of Waste Collection, Street Cleansing and Ancillary Services Contract

To consider proposals relating to a Waste Collection, Street Cleansing and Ancillary Services Contract.

For Decision
(Pages 101 - 110)

(C) Central London Works Programme

To consider proposals relating to the growth of the Central London Works Programme.

For Decision
(Pages 111 - 114)

24 **Audit and Risk Management Committee**

To consider the procurement approach for the appointment of an External Auditor for City Fund.

For Decision
(Pages 115 - 118)



PARMLEY, LOCUM TENENS

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

11th September 2025
MEMBERS PRESENT

ALDERMEN

Alexander Robertson Martin Barr (Alderman)	Robert Charles Hughes-Penney (Alderman)	Christopher Makin (Alderman)
Sir Charles Edward Beck Bowman (Alderman)	Gregory Jones KC (Alderman & Sheriff)	Bronek Masojada (Alderman)
Professor Emma Edhem (Alderman)	Vincent Keaveny CBE (Alderman)	Jennette Rachel Newman (Alderwoman)
Alison Gowman CBE (Alderman)	Elizabeth Anne King, BEM JP (Alderwoman)	Sir Andrew Charles Parmley, (Alderman)
Prem Goyal CBE (Alderman)	Tim Levene (Alderman)	Kawsar Zaman (Alderman)
Martha Grekos (Alderwoman)	Sir Nicholas Stephen Leland Lyons (Alderman)	
Timothy Russell Hailes (Alderman)	Professor Michael Raymond Mainelli (Alderman)	

COMMONERS

Joanna Tufuo Abeyie MBE	Henry Nicholas Almroth	Jaspreet Hodgson, Deputy	Chief Commoner James
George Christopher	Colthurst, Deputy	Adam Michael Hogg	Henry George Pollard,
Abrahams	Bethany Coombs, Deputy	Ann Holmes, Deputy	Deputy
Tana Adkin KC	Anne Corbett, Deputy	Amy Horscroft	Anett Rideg
Munsur Ali	Elizabeth Corrin	Shravan Jashvantrai Joshi,	Gaby Robertshaw
Samapti Bagchi	Karina Dostalova	MBE	Ruby Sayed
Shahnan Bakth	Simon Duckworth, OBE DL	Florence Keelson-Anfu	Tom Sleigh, Deputy
Jamel Banda	Peter Gerard Dunphy,	Philip Kelvin	Sir Michael Snyder, Deputy
Brendan Barns	Deputy	Helen Ladele	Naresh Hari Sonpar
Matthew Bell	John Ernest Edwards,	Charles Edward Lord, OBE	Stephanie Steeden
The Honourable Emily	Deputy	JP	Stuart Peter James
Sophia Wedgwood Benn,	Helen Lesley Fentimen OBE	Antony Geoffrey Manchester	Thompson
Deputy	JP, Deputy	Vasiliki Manta	James Michael Douglas
Christopher Paul Boden,	John William Fletcher,	Tessa Marchington	Thomson CBE, Deputy
Deputy	Deputy	Paul Nicholas Martinelli,	Tumbridge, James
Keith David Forbes	John Foley	Deputy	William Upton KC
Bottomley, Deputy	Dawn Frampton	Tim McNally	Matthew Waters
Leyla Boulton	Steve Goodman OBE	Andrien Gereith Dominic	Jacqueline Roberts Webster
Tijs Broeke	Jason Groves	Meyers, Deputy	Mark Raymond Peter Henry
Simon Burrows	Madush Gupta, Deputy	Sophia Mooney	Delano Wheatley
Timothy Richard Butcher,	Mercy Haggerty	Suzanne Ornsby KC	Ceri Wilkins, Deputy
Deputy	Caroline Wilma Haines,	Leyla Ostovar	Philip Woodhouse
Dominic Gerard Christian	Deputy	Fraser Stuart Peck	Dawn Linsey Wright, Deputy
Lesley Cole	Josephine Hayes		Irem Yerdelen
Melissa Rachel Collett	Christopher Michael		
	Hayward, Deputy		

1. Apologies The apologies of those Members unable to attend this meeting of the Court were noted.
2. Declarations There were none.

3. Minutes *Resolved* – That the public minutes and non-public summary of the Court meeting on 24 July 2025 are correctly recorded.
4. Mayoral Engagements In the Lord Mayor's absence, there was no Report.
5. Policy Statement The Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee took the opportunity to make a statement, welcoming Members back after recess and paying tribute to those officers involved in responding to the wildfires across the Corporation's Open Spaces. He continued by noting the impact of the tube strikers on City workers, and the recent launch of the City Living Resident Card. He informed Members of his recent visit to India, and the launch of the new Investment Hub. The Chairman was looking forward to working with the Government's new City Minister, the new Minister of State for Investment, alongside the entire reshuffled Cabinet and would be promoting the Square Mile at the various party conferences over the next few weeks.
6. Appointments The Court proceeded to consider the following appointments.
- (A) **Castle Baynard Educational Foundation & Alderman Samuel Wilson Fund** (three vacancies for three-year terms expiring in May 2028).
Nomination(s) received:-
Ruby Sayed
- Read.
- Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Ruby Sayed to be appointed to the Castle Baynard Educational Foundation & Alderman Samuel Wilson Fund.
- (B) **City Chapter and Percy Trentham Charity** (one vacancy for a five-year term expiring in April 2030)
Nomination(s) received:-
Ruby Sayed
- Read.
- Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Ruby Sayed to be appointed to the City Chapter and Percy Trentham Charity.
- (C) **Mitchell City of London Charity and Educational Foundation** (two vacancies for five-year terms expiring in March 2030)
Nomination(s) received:-
Ruby Sayed
- Read.
- Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Ruby Sayed to be appointed to the Mitchell City of London Charity and Educational Foundation.

7. CITY OF LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD

(Tijs Broeke)

12 August 2025

Appointment of an Independent External Member to the City of London Police Authority Board.

The Court considered a Report concerning the re-appointment of an external member, namely, Sir Craig Mackey, to the City of London Police Authority Board for a four-year term commencing 11 September 2025.

Resolved- that the Court: Approve the re-appointment of Sir Craig Mackey to the City of London Police Authority Board for a four-year term, commencing on 11 September 2025.

8. 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:

Alisa Ansari-Nezhad <i>Simon Phillip Bannister</i> <i>John Edward Slater</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Elmbridge, Surrey
Nigel David Bacon <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i> <i>Ald. Michael Raymond Mainelli</i>	a Chamber of Commerce Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen and World Trader</i>	Essex
Matthew Thomas Baird <i>Gwenllian Mari Rhys</i> <i>Jonathan Martin Averbs</i>	a Political Adviser <i>Citizen and Glass Seller</i> <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i>	Croydon, London
Colin Clive Baldwin <i>Roy Phillips</i> <i>Robert James Phillips, VR</i>	a Pilot <i>Citizen and Musician</i> <i>Citizen and Skinner</i>	Haslemere, Surrey
Carl Wilhelm Magnus Bergholtz <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i> <i>Ald. Alastair John Naisbitt King, DL</i>	a Banker <i>Citizen</i> <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Wandsworth, London
Stephen William Bolton <i>Russell David Pridgeon</i> <i>Revd. Christopher John Damp</i>	an Operations Director, retired <i>Citizen and Scientific Instrument Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Stationer & Newspaper Maker</i>	Warrington, Cheshire
Atticus Branch <i>Colin Trevor Gurnett</i> <i>John Charles Jordan</i>	an E-Commerce Executive <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Hackney, London

Thomas James Broad <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i> <i>Samapti Bagchi, CC</i>	an Accountant <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Brentwood, Essex
Franklin Roy Bruno, MBE <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Ald. Robert Picton Seymour</i> <i>Howard</i>	a Boxer, retired <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Gardener</i>	Essex
Colin John Burke <i>John Piers Williamson</i> <i>Ian Rex Peacock</i>	a Financial Services Company Director <i>Citizen and Currier</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Wimbledon, London
Emmanuelle Eva Yolaine Bury <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i> <i>Christopher Michael</i> <i>Hayward, Deputy</i>	a Banker <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Kensington & Chelsea, London
Beauman Sing Tat Chong <i>Andrew Stratton</i> <i>McMurtrie, JP</i> <i>The Honourable Mrs</i> <i>Virginia Lovell</i>	an Information Technology Company Director, retired <i>Citizen and Salter</i> <i>Citizen and Barber</i>	Winchester, Hampshire
Hugh Alexander Christie <i>Robert Maurice Andrews</i> <i>Simon John McMenemy,</i> <i>VR</i>	a Barrister & Solicitor <i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre</i> <i>Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i>	Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Ruth Elizabeth Clapton <i>Timothy James McNally,</i> <i>CC</i> <i>David James Sales, CC</i>	a Solicitor <i>Citizen and Glazier</i> <i>Citizen and Insurer</i>	Bromley, London
Ernest Michael Cleave <i>Robert Maurice Andrews</i> <i>Jeffrey Richard Lewis</i>	a Mining Company Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre</i> <i>Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Oakville, Ontario, Canada
Dr Harry Tenumu Conway <i>Adewale Oladele-Ajose</i> <i>Oluwatosin Ajose</i>	a Diplomat <i>Citizen and Poulter</i> <i>Citizen and Poulter</i>	Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire
Sarah Nicola Cosby <i>Stephen David Willis</i> <i>Dr Millan Sachania</i>	a Governance Manager <i>Citizen and Musician</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Haringey, London
Dr Rohit Kumar Dasgupta <i>Munsur Ali, CC</i>	a Professor of Economics & Local Councillor <i>Citizen and World Trader</i>	Newham, London

<i>Jason Pritchard, CC</i>	<i>Citizen</i>	
Geoffrey Richard Day <i>Roy Phillips</i> <i>Robert James Phillips, VR</i>	a Pilot, retired <i>Citizen and Musician</i> <i>Citizen and Skinner</i>	Boston, Lincolnshire
Melissia Dyan Dembrosky <i>Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP</i> <i>Madush Gupta, Deputy</i>	a Banking Executive <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Billericay, Essex
Unmesh Desai <i>Munsur Ali, CC</i> <i>Jason Pritchard, CC</i>	a Local Government Councillor <i>Citizen and World Trader</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Newham, London
Kate Antonia Donovan <i>James Michael Douglas Thomson, CBE, Deputy</i> <i>Robert Anthony Atkin, MBE</i>	a Cost Management Director <i>Citizen and Grocer</i> <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	Oxfordshire
Daniel John Drogman <i>James Richard Tumbridge, CC</i> <i>Jason Scott Groves, CC</i>	a Software Company Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i> <i>Citizen and Communicator</i>	Loughton, Essex
Thomas William Drogman <i>James Richard Tumbridge, CC</i> <i>Jason Scott Groves, CC</i>	a Software Company Director <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i> <i>Citizen and Communicator</i>	Islington, London
Conor John Farrelly <i>Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP</i> <i>Madush Gupta, Deputy</i>	a Business Consultant <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Dublin, Ireland
Elizabeth Roman Fullerton Rome <i>James St John Davis, CC</i> <i>Oliver Matthew St John Davis</i>	an Independent Non-Executive Director <i>Citizen and Gardener</i> <i>Citizen and Woolman</i>	Wandsworth, London
Michelle Louise Grasty <i>Jamel Banda, CC</i> <i>Nicholas Julian Goddard</i>	a School Administrator <i>Citizen and Poulter</i> <i>Citizen and Barber</i>	Epsom, Surrey
Alison Michelle Griffin <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i> <i>Christopher Michael Hayward, Deputy</i>	Chief Executive of London Councils <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Greenwich, London

Daniel Joel Harris	a Technology Risk Consultant	Peterborough, Cambridgeshire
<i>Naresh Hari Sonpar, CC</i>	<i>Citizen</i>	
<i>Timothy James McNally, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Glazier</i>	
The Rt Hon Sir John Henry Hayes, CBE	a Member of Parliament	Spalding, Lincolnshire
<i>The Rt. Hon. Sir Robert George Alexander Balchin</i>	<i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i>	
<i>Nigel Anthony Chimmo Branson, JP</i>	<i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i>	
Garry Ronald Hilditch	a Creative Director	Loughton, Essex
<i>Terry Kenneth Morris</i>	<i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	
<i>Anthony Norman Taylor</i>	<i>Citizen and Fletcher</i>	
Brian David Hunt	an Underwriting Manager	Teddington, Middlesex
<i>Donald Howard Coombe, MBE</i>	<i>Citizen and Poulter</i>	
<i>Martin Bernard Robinson</i>	<i>Citizen and Poulter</i>	
Zinzan Douglas Ralph Hunter	a Research Analyst	Hammersmith & Fulham, London
<i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i>	<i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	
<i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	<i>Citizen</i>	
William Michael Jackson	a Minister of Religion	Hounslow, London
<i>David William Henderson-Begg</i>	<i>Citizen and Tin Plate Worker Alias Wire Worker</i>	
<i>Revd William Jeremy Hugh Crossley</i>	<i>Citizen and Glover</i>	
Mohammed Athair Khan	a Chamber of Commerce Director	Newcastle upon Tyne, Tyne and Wear
<i>Shahnan Bakth, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Draper</i>	
<i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i>	<i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i>	
Oli Khan, MBE	an Entrepreneur & Restaurateur	Luton, Bedfordshire
<i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i>	<i>Citizen and Glover</i>	
<i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	<i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	
Margaret King, MBE JP	a Fashion Brand Company Director	Wandsworth, London
<i>Susan Liv Keane, JP</i>	<i>Citizen and Glazier</i>	
<i>Dr Iain Reid</i>	<i>Citizen and Ironmonger</i>	
Adam Luke, JP	a Magistrate & Civil Servant	Lambeth, London
<i>Naresh Hari Sonpar, CC</i>	<i>Citizen</i>	
<i>Timothy James McNally, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Glazier</i>	

John Swan Lauder Machray <i>John Alexander Smail</i> <i>Stephen James Osborne</i>	an Environmental Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Distiller</i> <i>Citizen and Chartered Secretary & Administrator</i>	Maidenhead, Berkshire
Mohamed Saif Ullah Malik <i>Shahnan Bakth, CC</i> <i>Ald. Sir Peter Kenneth Estlin</i>	a Bank Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Draper</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Kensington & Chelsea, London
Felix Nicholas May <i>Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP</i> <i>Madush Gupta, Deputy</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Lambeth, London
John Denis McGowan <i>Ald. Vincent Thomas Keaveny, CBE</i> <i>Amanda Josephine Keaveny</i>	a Property Development Company Director <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i> <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i>	Hertfordshire
Martina Elizabeth McKenzie, MBE <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i> <i>Aaron Anthony Jose Hasan D'Souza, CC</i>	a Business Federation Director <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	County Antrim, Northern Ireland
Martin Gerard McTague, OBE <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i> <i>Aaron Anthony Jose Hasan D'Souza, CC</i>	a Business Federation Chair <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	County Durham
Luke Andrew Middleton <i>Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP</i> <i>Madush Gupta, Deputy</i>	a Localisation Consultancy Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Dublin, Ireland
Amanda Susan Mond <i>Brendan Anthony Michael Barns, CC</i> <i>James Michael Douglas Thomson, CBE, Deputy</i>	an Investment Analyst <i>Citizen and Cordwainer</i> <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Westminster, London
Kevin Robert Mulcahy <i>Randall Keith Anderson</i> <i>Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst, Deputy</i>	an I.T. Assistant Director <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i> <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Billerica, Essex
Jeremy Mullins <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i> <i>Ald. Elizabeth Anne King, BEM, JP</i>	an Audit Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Hornchurch, Essex

Michael Thomas Penny <i>Christopher James Caine</i> <i>Clive Anthony Hawkins</i>	a Solicitor, retired <i>Citizen and Maker of Playing Cards</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Torquay, Devon
Dr Felipe Eduardo Portela De Paulo <i>Matthew David Dupee</i> <i>Steven John Turner</i>	a Lawyer <i>Citizen and Maker of Playing Cards</i> <i>Citizen and Arts Scholar</i>	Botafogo, Rio De Janeiro, Brazil
Annie Renee Quaradeghini <i>David Charles Johnson</i> <i>Lin Wong</i>	a Property Management Company Director, retired <i>Citizen and Management Consultant</i> <i>Citizen and Management Consultant</i>	Westminster, London
Professor Muttukrishnan Rajarajan <i>Madush Gupta, Deputy</i> <i>Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP</i>	a Professor of Security Engineering <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Watford, Hertfordshire
Dr Nesrine Ramadan <i>Ald. Michael Raymond Mainelli</i> <i>David Anthony Bickmore</i>	a Neuroscientist & Entrepreneur <i>Citizen and World Trader</i> <i>Citizen and Wax Chandler</i>	Thiais, France
Maria Inmaculada Rios Ternerero <i>John Alexander Smail</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Solicitor <i>Citizen and Distiller</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Lewisham, London
Bevan Wynn Roberts <i>Wg Cdr Edna Felicity Partridge</i> <i>Sandra Diane Cahill, DL</i>	a Horticulture Business Owner <i>Citizen and Founder</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Caterham, Surrey
Captain Earl Patrick Shea, KC <i>Robert Maurice Andrews</i> <i>Jeffrey Richard Lewis</i>	a Barrister & Solicitor <i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Zilah Ruth Skerritt <i>Wendy Mead, OBE, CC</i> <i>Paul Nicholas Martinelli, Deputy</i>	a Cable Manufacturing Company General Manager <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Butcher</i>	Woodford, Essex
Rory Neil Slater <i>David Alastair Morgan-Hewitt</i> <i>Philippe Roland Rossiter</i>	a Hotelier <i>Citizen and Innholder</i> <i>Citizen and Innholder</i>	Sevenoaks, Kent
Tatjana Slykova <i>Simon Phillip Bannister</i> <i>John Edward Slater</i>	a Media Consultancy Chief Financial Officer <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Elmbridge, Surrey

Gavin Renwick Starks <i>Madush Gupta, Deputy</i> <i>Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP</i>	a Data Infrastructure Company Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Tower Hamlets, London
Charlie George Stock <i>Jonathan Charles Mead</i> <i>Barry John Frederick</i> <i>Theobald-Hicks of Danbury</i>	a Scaffolder <i>Citizen and Horner</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	Gravesend, Kent
Holly Jean Stock <i>Jonathan Charles Mead</i> <i>Barry John Frederick</i> <i>Theobald-Hicks of Danbury</i>	an Accounts Assistance <i>Citizen and Horner</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	Gravesend, Kent
Tracy Kathryn Stones <i>Lyn Litchfield</i> <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i>	a Wrist Wearables Company Director <i>Citizen and Coachmaker & Coach</i> <i>Harness Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Leeds, West Yorkshire
Despina Tsatsas <i>Ald. Sir William Anthony</i> <i>Bowater Russell</i> <i>Tijs Broeke, CC</i>	a Theatre Producer <i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i> <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i>	Islington, London
Asad Uddin <i>Ald. Kawsar Zaman</i> <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i>	a Charity Chief Executive <i>Citizen</i> <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i>	Newham, London
Md Ahsanul Wadud <i>Ald. Kawsar Zaman</i> <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i>	a Legal Consultant <i>Citizen</i> <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i>	Havering, London
Jason Keith Iestyn Walker <i>Alan Keith Iestyn Walker</i> <i>John Donington Campbell, OBE, MA</i>	a Wealth Manager <i>Citizen and Painter-Stainer</i> <i>Citizen and Tallow Chandler</i>	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States of America
Nicholas Edward Walker <i>Simon Victor Langton</i> <i>Paul Stephen Hollebone</i>	a Police Officer, retired <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i>	Surrey
Darren Oliver Walsh <i>David Alastair Morgan-Hewitt</i> <i>Philippe Roland Rossiter</i>	a Hotel Group Manager <i>Citizen and Innholder</i> <i>Citizen and Innholder</i>	Glossop, Derbyshire
Marc James Whitley <i>Wendy Mead, OBE, CC</i> <i>Mark Anthony Grove</i>	a College Lecturer <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Cook</i>	Westminster, London
Joshua Shawn Wilberger	a Civil Servant	Fredericksburg, Virginia, United States of America

Jeffrey Richard Lewis *Citizen and International Banker*
Brady Daine Brim-Deforest *Citizen and Fletcher*
of Balvaird Castle

Raymond Andrew Winstone an Actor Essex
The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor *Citizen and Blacksmith*
Ald. Sir William Anthony *Citizen and Haberdasher*
Bowater Russell

Mark Steven Lozarito Wolfisz an Actuarial Consultant Tower Hamlets, London
Madush Gupta, Deputy *Citizen and Pewterer*
Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, *Citizen and Pewterer*
JP

Gary Nolan Woods a Telecommunications Planner, Stevenage,
retired Hertfordshire
John Alexander Smail *Citizen and Distiller*
Stephen James Osborne *Citizen and Chartered Secretary &*
Administrator

Teresa Margaret Wren a Pensions Administrator, Ilford, Essex
retired
Wendy Mead, OBE, CC *Citizen and Glover*
Patricia Agnes Campfield, *Citizen and Wheelwright*
MBE

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.

9. Motion
Wheatley, M.
R.P. H. D.
Lord, C.E., OBE,
JP

By Mark Raymond Peter Henry Delano Wheatley

Motion –

1. “That This Honourable Court notes that:-

- a. The City of London Corporation has a unique and complex role in the provision, management, and oversight of housing within and beyond the Square Mile. We own and manage several housing estates both within and outside the City boundaries, and it engages with residents, stakeholders, and external agencies on a wide range of housing-related issues, including affordability, quality, and safety.
- b. At present, these functions are divided between a number of our various Committees and Sub-Committees.
- c. In light of the evolving nature of housing policy, the growing strategic importance of housing in the Corporation’s service delivery and reputation, and in recognition of feedback from residents and Members alike, there is

increasing interest in reviewing whether a dedicated Housing Committee of the Court of Common Council should be established.

- d. Such a committee could provide more focused oversight, strategic leadership, and accountability for the Corporation's housing responsibilities. However, given the implications of such a structural change, this Court affirms that a period of careful consideration, consultation, and evidence-gathering is essential.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 26(1), which requires that any new Sub-Committee or Working Party shall be subject to the approval of the Policy & Resources Committee, and Standing Order 26(2) which sets out the process of appointment for Chairs and Deputy Chairs of Sub-Committees¹ this Honourable Court consequently agrees:
- a. To establish a task and finish Working Party to consider whether or not the Court of Common Council should create a dedicated Committee that would oversee the City Corporation's housing functions that are currently under the auspices of the Community & Children's Services Committee and Barbican Residential Committee.
 - b. That such a Working Party shall be composed of no more than twelve Members, to be elected by the full Common Council at the next formal meeting of the Court.
 - c. That no fewer than six Members of the Working Party, shall be residents within the City of London.
 - d. That the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Working Party be elected by the Working Party's membership, at its first meeting.
 - e. The Working Party shall be expected to:
 - i. Call upon internal and external experts to provide evidence or advice as required.
 - ii. Use existing resource or make resource bids (as required) via its parent committee to seek resident opinion to ensure that the voices of tenants, leaseholders, and other housing stakeholders are heard and considered diligently.
 - iii. Examine governance models in other local authorities or relevant bodies for comparative purposes
 - f. The Working Party shall report into the Policy & Resources Committee that will be required to make a recommendation back to the Court with its findings and recommendations within twelve months of first convening. The report should include:
 - i. An assessment of the current governance arrangements for all housing functions within scope.
 - ii. Analysis of the benefits and risks of creating a single dedicated Housing Committee.
 - iii. A summary of all stakeholder engagement.
 - iv. A recommendation on whether to proceed with the establishment of such a committee, and if so, proposals for its remit and structure."

In opening the debate, Mr Wheatley commented that, at its June meeting, the Court acknowledged its historic neglect of social housing. At its previous meeting, the Court had committed to explore all options to accelerate the renovation of the City's Housing Estates; Officers had been acting at pace and Members were appreciative of the resourcing efforts.

Supporters of this Motion believed that, without the correct governance structures the resourcing will be to no good end. The Court of Common Council adopted a Committee System but there was no single Committee for the entirety of its housing structure and provision.

Mr Wheatley reminded Members that Lord Lisvane's Governance Review in 2020 included the recommendation to establish a Housing Committee; that recommendation was considered over the following year, and it was decided to defer that decision to this civic year. Whilst the Movers of this Motion were not pre-judging that decision, they were recommending and seeking the Court's approval to create a structure and process through which the best possible decision can be taken. The Movers wished a number of Members to convene to go deep into these issues, supported by officers and expert guidance, which would include residents, and in a deliberative, consensual, and measured fashion consider the evidence before them.

Seconding the Motion, Charles Edward Lord emphasised the City Corporation's proud record of being the provider of municipal housing,; however, we have a situation with our housing stock that is lamentable as a result of neglect.

Charles Edward Lord believed that one of the reasons for this neglect was the governance arrangements for housing; they reminded Members that in 2002, the changes to the Community and Children's Services Committee were made in conjunction with the decision to merge the former Housing Department with Social Services and Education. When it came to the Department itself, putting social services with housing and education meant that the statutory Director, now the Executive Director for the Department must be a social worker, as a consequence of which the Corporation lost leadership at the executive level from someone who had a background in housing management. The Community and Children's Services Committee covered a number of local authority functions, as a consequence of which, it was felt that it could not provide a level of scrutiny and oversight that the housing stock required.

The Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee informed the Court that he had spoken to Honourable Members over the past few weeks and it had been apparent that there was some appetite for the establishment of a Working Party to investigate the governance around the City Corporation's housing arrangements; equally, many colleagues had relayed concerns about timing and not diverting focus from ongoing efforts to fix the Estates. Therefore, the Chairman wished to Move an Amendment to the Motion which he hoped Mr Wheatley would support; the Amendment had two substantive parts; firstly, to alter membership of the Working Party, amending 2b and deleting 2c, and secondly, to specify when the Working Party would first meet, amending 2d. The Chairman had prepared this Amendment and provided it to the Town Clerk, who in turn, had circulated it to honourable Members of the Court for their consideration upon arrival this day.

The Chairman proposed that the Court amended the proposed Membership under point 2b to ensure input from the relevant Committees, that is to say, the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Community and Children's Services Committee, the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee, the Barbican Residential Committee, and the Policy & Resources Committee; those responsible for, and knowledgeable of, housing, and, in the case of Policy & Resources, governance, within their briefs.

The Chairman also proposed the deletion of 2c, which specifies a number of residential Members; the inclusion of those ex-officio Members will place some residential Members on to the Working Party, but substantively this relates to City residents only, and it was important to note that many of those living in our housing live outside of the City. He also felt it was important that the Court did not artificially narrow our engagement aspirations with those living in our housing by virtue of having a small number of residential Members on the Working Party, the City needed to be broad and inclusive in that engagement and listen to what all our residents think. The Chairman wanted to see a full consultation with residents as part of the Working Party's activities.

Regarding 2d, the Chairman was conscious of the organisation's limited resource, the Housing Team were busy working on the recently announced Social Housing Inspection and progressing long overdue repairs to our Estates, laying the groundwork for our transformative Housing Investment Programme. The Governance and Member Services Team was also at capacity. Therefore, the Chairman proposed that 2d was altered to amend the start date of the Working Party; this would allow for the organisation to properly identify and allocate the required resource from officers in both departments. The Chairman hoped that it was clear that this was not a delay tactic; He concluded by expressing his hopes that Members would concur that this Amendment would provide officers the time to organise resourcing arrangements for this Working Party, should the Court decide to support it.

Hayward, C.M.,
Deputy
Thomson, J. M.
D., CBE, Deputy

Amendment – That this Honourable Court agreed to delete paragraph 2c) and amend paragraphs 2b) and 2d), as follows:

"2b) That such a Working Party shall be composed of no more than twelve Members, comprising:

- eight Members to be elected by the full Common Council at the next formal meeting of the Court; and
- four ex-officio Members, namely the Chairmen (or nominated Deputy Chairmen) of the Community and Children's Services Committee, the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee, the Barbican Residential Committee, and the Policy & Resources Committee."

"2d) That the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Working Party be elected by the Working Party's membership, at its first meeting which will be held no earlier than 1 March 2026 and no later than 31 March 2026."

Deputy James Thomson seconded the Amendment, expressing his view that these changes ensured that the Working Party would have the right membership and was sufficiently resourced to explore all options for the best way forward for housing governance. He highlighted that the governance arrangements currently reflect the diverse nature of the City Corporation's housing, and, as the Chairman of Policy &

Resources had pointed out, it can be easy to forget that a large number of housing tenants live in boroughs around London and not in the Square Mile itself.

In February 2024, the Community and Children's Services Committee agreed that a comprehensive Review of governance arrangements should be undertaken in 2026. Deputy Thomson emphasised that a Review, guided by interested Members in the form of this Working Party, with the membership proposed by the Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee, was the right approach. Whether this Working Party resolves that the current governance arrangements are the right ones or determines that something new was needed was for that Working Party to examine and bring back; the salient point was that it met its recommendations through deep and proper engagement with the Corporation's residents, both within the City and beyond, and it listened carefully to their views.

Ultimately, the City had to ensure that it was best positioned to deliver for residents across all our provision. An important step has been the appointment of a new officer team which was working at pace to improve conditions across the housing stock, together with Members on the various Committees dealing with housing who are also working very hard to deliver for those living in the housing that the City provides; the proposed extension of time is necessary for officer teams to progress this work, to focus on the Inspection that is currently in process, and to find the funding solution, all of which are moving at pace. With all this in mind, Deputy Thomson expressed his support for the Motion with the Amendments proposed by the Chairman of Policy and Resources which will create a more effective and efficient Working Party to carry out this Review. Furthermore, he acknowledged that Members would have different views on the outcomes of the Review but that was not for the Court to decide today; he hoped with that in mind that Members would support the Amended Motion.

During debate on the Amendment, Mr Wheatly remarked that he felt the Amendments improved the Motion; they addressed both composition and timing concerns that had been raised, so he was happy to take them and recommended that the Amended Motion be debated by the Court.

Broad support for the Amendment was expressed by a number of Members, but there were also concerns voiced over the timing. Some felt that, even with the delay, the Working Party would put unwelcome demands on already stretched officers, distracting them from delivering the necessary change.

There was a request that under 2d, that every effort be made to bring forward the dates of March 2026, if it became possible.

Reassurance was sought that that this initiative should take the opportunity to address all of the collective needs of all residents.

It was requested that if in due course a Housing Committee was established, that it was done so in a way that did not create a net increase in the number of Committees; this would also assist in terms of officer capacity.

The Chair of Community and Children's Services Committee, Deputy Helen Fentimen, stated that many Members were aware that there existed significantly different funding arrangements and priorities of our Estates; this was understood by the Barbican Residential Committee and the Community and Children's Services Committee between 18-24 months ago and at that time, in recognition of those differences, the management structures were separated so that the City Corporation could specifically focus on the issues pertinent to the Barbican Residential Estate

and those that were quite different for social housing estates. The City Corporation was undertaking a major and extensive workplan for social housing and the Barbican Residential Estate, in addition to dealing with the recently announced Housing Safety Regulation Inspection and as such, it was critical that officers were not taken off that important work and the best possible outcome was secured for our housing. However, the Amendments go some way to address these concerns, not least around timing; Members had already given their commitment to consider governance in 2026, and the change in timing proposed in the Amendment honoured this commitment. If the Court was minded to support a Review of Governance and agreed to the Amendments, she would feel much more willing to support the Motion.

Concern was expressed over the long suffering of residents as a result of the ongoing neglect to the housing provision.

It was commented that over 50% of the City's residential population did not live on the City's Housing Estates and that their needs should also not be underrepresented in any new committee regime.

Thanks were offered in response to the continued hard work and effort of officers within the Housing Team.

The Mover of the Amendment, the Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee, rose to respond to the comments raised by honourable Members.

The Chairman stressed that for the City Corporation to retain credibility with its Resident Reset Policy, it was important that the organisation was seen to be transparent and that it honoured its commitment that were previously made to residents, so he hoped that the City was able to demonstrate to residents that it was not going to dictate to residents what form of governance housing would have without listening to them and the detailed deliberations of the Working Party.

The Chairman clarified that the revised timing had been calculated on the basis that; the Housing Inspection was not due to conclude until February 2026, and therefore March was the next logical date that should be targeted to allow for any potential overrun.

He agreed that the City Corporation should look at all views from across our housing estates on this matter and also that the Court should avoid encouraging any proliferation of new Committees.

The Chairman reiterated that a commitment had been made to come back to the Court at the beginning of 2026 and the Corporation had to honour that if it was to retain the confidence and trust of residents.

To conclude, the Chairman fully endorsed the tribute to those officers involved with these matters who had done an incredible job under huge pressure over the past few years.

As the Mover of the substantive Motion, Mr Wheatley concluded the debate by thanking colleagues for their contributions, he praised officers for all their hard work and expressed that he was happy to take the Amendment and hoped that it would be approved.

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

Resolved – That this Honourable Court agreed to delete paragraph 2c) and amend paragraphs 2b) and 2d) (to then become 2c), as follows:

“2b) That such a Working Party shall be composed of no more than twelve Members, comprising:

- eight Members to be elected by the full Common Council at the next formal meeting of the Court; and
- four ex-officio Members, namely the Chairmen (or nominated Deputy Chairmen) of the Community and Children's Services Committee, the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee, the Barbican Residential Committee, and the Policy & Resources Committee.”

“2d) That the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Working Party be elected by the Working Party's membership, at its first meeting which will be held no earlier than 1 March 2026 and no later than 31 March 2026.”

Turning to the substantive (amended) Motion, a concern was once again raised over the capacity of those officers involved with housing matters who were working incredibly hard and that any risk of distracting them from their principle task to focus instead on governance changes must be avoided.

If the Motion was passed and the Working Party began its deliberations, it was asked that it took into account that the voice of Social Housing tenants who were often amongst the most vulnerable in society, was protected.

It was reflected that Court and the Community and Children's Services Committee had failed in their duties over these matters over the course of many years, and all Members as a consequence should be contrite about that. Some felt that the priority needed to be work, not governance. It was emphasised that the substantive work was not going to be delivered via this Working Party, and focus should be on the renovation programme which needed to be considerably accelerated.

Mr Wheatley concluded the debate concerning the substantive (amended) Motion by thanking Members for their contributions. He emphasised his fulsome support for the need for the Working Party, if approved, to represent and listen to all voices. He suggested that, with the Amendments in place, housing officers would avoid being unduly distracted from their core focus.

Mr Wheatley agreed that the Working Party was certainly not the answer to the renovation challenges, but he felt it would be the vehicle in which the Court would find the answer. The Working Party would, he hoped and trusted, find the answer. In conclusion, he thanked the Lord Mayor, the Town Clerk, officers, and fellow Members and hoped that at the end of the debate the Court would decide and resolve to address the question of governance of housing once and for all.

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

1. *Resolved* – This Honourable Court notes that:-

- a. The City of London Corporation has a unique and complex role in the provision, management, and oversight of housing within and beyond the Square Mile. We own and manage several housing estates both within and outside the City boundaries, and it engages with residents,

stakeholders, and external agencies on a wide range of housing-related issues, including affordability, quality, and safety.

- b. At present, these functions are divided between a number of our various Committees and Sub-Committees.
 - c. In light of the evolving nature of housing policy, the growing strategic importance of housing in the Corporation's service delivery and reputation, and in recognition of feedback from residents and Members alike, there is increasing interest in reviewing whether a dedicated Housing Committee of the Court of Common Council should be established.
 - d. Such a committee could provide more focused oversight, strategic leadership, and accountability for the Corporation's housing responsibilities. However, given the implications of such a structural change, this Court affirms that a period of careful consideration, consultation, and evidence-gathering is essential.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 26(1), which requires that any new Sub-Committee or Working Party shall be subject to the approval of the Policy & Resources Committee, and Standing Order 26(2) which sets out the process of appointment for Chairs and Deputy Chairs of Sub-Committees this Honourable Court consequently agrees:
- a. To establish a task and finish Working Party to consider whether or not the Court of Common Council should create a dedicated Committee that would oversee the City Corporation's housing functions that are currently under the auspices of the Community & Children's Services Committee and Barbican Residential Committee.
 - b. That such a Working Party shall be composed of no more than twelve Members, comprising:
 - eight Members to be elected by the full Common Council at the next formal meeting of the Court; and
 - four ex-officio Members, namely the Chairmen (or nominated Deputy Chairmen) of the Community and Children's Services Committee, the Housing Management and Almshouses Sub-Committee, the Barbican Residential Committee, and the Policy & Resources Committee.
 - c. That the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Working Party be elected by the Working Party's membership, at its first meeting which will be held no earlier than 1 March 2026 and no later than 31 March 2026.
 - d. The Working Party shall be expected to:
 - i. Call upon internal and external experts to provide evidence or advice as required.
 - ii. Use existing resource, or make resource bids (as required) via its parent committee to seek resident opinion to ensure that the voices of tenants, leaseholders, and other housing stakeholders are heard and considered diligently.

- iii. Examine governance models in other local authorities or relevant bodies for comparative purposes.
- e. The Working Party shall report into the Policy & Resources Committee that will be required to make a recommendation back to the Court with its findings and recommendations within twelve months of first convening. The report should include:
 - i. An assessment of the current governance arrangements for all housing functions within scope.
 - ii. Analysis of the benefits and risks of creating a single dedicated Housing Committee.
 - iii. A summary of all stakeholder engagement.
 - iv. A recommendation on whether to proceed with the establishment of such a committee, and if so, proposals for its remit and structure.”

10. CITY OF LONDON POLICE AUTHORITY BOARD

(Tijs Broeke)

23 July 2025

City of London Police: Annual Report 2024/25

The Court received a Report concerning the achievements of the City of London Police for the past financial year.

The Chair stated that he was very pleased to present the Report to the Court, it gave a good overview of the City of London Police’s progress and where it stands today. Recorded anti-social behaviour had continued to fall, the City had maintained the lowest rate of serious violence in the capital, and outcomes remained well above the national average.

The City Police were also focussing on everyday crimes that impact people; shoplifting, theft, phone snatching, and violence against women and girls. In 2024/25, the City Police launched Operation Swipe, to deter, detect, and prevent phone snatching, this combined targeted patrols with visible public messaging, including distinctive blue plaques marking hotspots and arrest locations; in the last quarter alone, snatch theft fell by 23% compared with the same period the year before.

Through intelligence led policing, resources are being directed to where they have the greatest effect. A quarter of violent offences occur in only 2% of the City’s streets; last year, over 11,000 additional patrol hours helped reduce serious violence and led to more than 250 arrests, making the City’s streets safer and making the Square Mile a premier destination for all.

Alongside this, the City Police continue to lead nationally in tackling fraud, economic and cybercrime. Operation Henhouse 3, a partnership initiative with the National Crime Agency, intensified investigations into fraud, resulting in 440 arrests and £19m recovered in seizures, a 52% increase in arrests compared to the previous year. The

City Police was also working with partners to establish a new service to replace Action Fraud later this year.

This summer's Peel Inspection graded the City Police outstanding for crime recording and good for both investigations and responses to the public, among the strongest results the City Police has ever received and bringing the City Police high up in the national Police Forces ranking. The outcome rate for violence against women and girls offences was now four times the national average; this was a testament to the Commissioner, his leadership team, and everyone working for the Police Service delivering high quality policing in the City of London.

These results truly underlined the vital contribution that the City Police, working with the Police Authority to ensure the Square Mile remains safe, secure, and dynamic for all who live, work, and visit it.

Resolved- that the Court noted the Report.

11. Ballot Results

There were no ballots taken at the last Court.

12. Questions Gupta, M Deputy to the Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee

Electoral Review

Deputy Madush Gupta asked the Chairman of the Policy & Resources Committee about a commitment made to this Honourable Court 21 months ago by the Chairman. In January 2024, when Deputy Gupta raised the urgent matter of the City's long-overdue electoral review, the Chairman assured the Court that work would commence immediately after the March 2025 elections.

He asked the Chairman to commit to a specific completion date for this electoral review and future reviews after each election cycle?

To begin with, the Chairman clarified that the work referred to comprised of two separate Reviews. Firstly, a Ward Boundary Review, which would cover allocation of Councillors to Wards. Secondly, and separately, a Franchise Review looking at who could vote in City elections and how. He could not today commit to the Court a completion date for either as both could take a number of years and have significant resource considerations and noted that they would require phasing; the Boundary Review would need to take place before any Review of the Franchise.

When Deputy Gupta raised this matter last year, the Chairman spoke to the Town Clerk about the arrangements needed to prepare for a Review after the March City elections, and as those have passed, officers have now begun preliminary work on the Boundary Wards Review. He stressed that this is very likely to be a very large piece of work, taking well over a year. Officers were currently working on a scoping Report, so activity has been taking place, but this had not yet been progressed to the Court of Common Council. Officers have committed that a Report will be brought before the Policy & Resources Committee this year.

As to the Review of the Franchise, this would come after the Boundary Ward Review; it would involve a substantial piece of policy work to determine options and make recommendations, and significant resource would need to be identified for that work. Any changes to the Franchise would necessitate a private bill in Parliament which could not reasonably be taken forward the Markets Bill had completed its Parliamentary passage, which was still some way off.

Charles Edward Lord remarked that the Franchise would have a significant impact on a Ward Boundary Review because the Review would have predicated on, at least in part, the number of electors. As a consequence, Councillor Lord asked the Chairman whether he would consider sequencing it the other way round. The Chairman emphasised that the City Corporation had made a commitment to Parliament to undertake a Ward Boundary Review and that needed to be undertaken before a Bill was submitted to them regarding the Franchise. The decisions taken as a result of the Boundary Review, could massively impact how it seeks to review the Franchise, so Members need to be clear about things that the City Corporation can do. Work had started on the Ward Boundary Review but as per the experience at the last “stock” Review in 2010, completion took between 18-24 months; HM Government is looking to bring ahead an Elections Bill in order to make various electoral reforms, and with that in mind, it made more sense to wait until that is concluded before a Franchise Review in the City is undertaken to ensure it was aligned with any changes brought about by the Government. In short, the Chairman proposed that whilst the Elections Bill progresses, the City could proceed with the Ward Boundary Review ahead of the Franchise Review.

Leyla Bolton asked the Chairman for an explanation about why the Markets Bill had been held up by an objection in Parliament and when would the Court see a Report come back about the learnings from the progression of the Markets Bill.

The Chairman responded that the Bill was going through Parliament and, as in any democratic institution, Parliament must take into account any representations, and, where there are questions, it would inevitably delay the passage of the Bill. He could not confirm currently how long that delay was going to be, however, officers have advised that they did not believe that it would be a significant. He added that there will be learnings from this Bill, and thanked the Remembrancer’s Department for their work which had been proper and correct.

Mr Groves remarked that the City had been very fortunate in recent years to have a huge amount of planning activity in the Eastern Cluster, and that this marked a great sign of confidence in the City of London from developers. As a consequence, Mr Groves asked the Chairman whether he would agree that the Ward Boundary Review would look at the future worker population and not the current statistic given the pipeline of tall buildings we have coming in, especially in the Eastern Cluster.

The Chairman responded that Mr Groves had made an excellent point, and it was something which had been raised in previous Boundary Reviews. Fundamentally, decision makers needed to look ahead and take into account what all the information says about growth and planning and we must look to base our numbers around that.

Mr Goodman remarked that one of the issues of the Franchise at the City Corporation, was the absence of rolling registration. Mr Goodman shared the view that the optimal approach would be to undertake the Franchise Review first and then the Ward Boundary Review.

The Chairman responded that the issue of rolling registration had been raised previously and was a very valid point; he supported it but reminded the Court that it was not something which was in the Court’s gift to enact and instead required Parliamentary legislation. Given that it falls within the scope of the Franchise Review and the Corporation would only have one opportunity to go to Parliament with these matters, he wanted to make sure that any approach is coherent, well thought through,

and included all the changes that the Court would seek to make instead of being piecemeal. He stood by his original assertion that the Ward Boundary Review should come ahead of the Franchise Review.

Mansion House Compact and Accord

*Hayes, J. to the
Chairman of the
Policy &
Resources
Committee*

Ms Josephine Hayes asked, given that the Mansion House Compact and Accord encouraged British pension funds to be invested in technology, whether the Chairman of Policy and Resources would confirm that this Court of Common Council was conscious that one of the main reasons for the 2008 financial crisis was excessive risk-taking in the years leading up to it? In addition, recognising that the government had to bail out a number of lenders which were too big to fail, at immense cost to the UK taxpayer; and that since pension funds are responsible for safeguarding long term pensions for their members, British pension fund trustees must be left to decide what risks they are prepared to take, without being influenced to engage in high risk investments?

The Chairman emphasised that at their heart, the Mansion House Compact and Accord were about getting the best possible retirement outcomes for hardworking people across the country. Nothing in the Accord altered the legal, consumer, or fiduciary duties of the signatories or diluted wider regulatory protections. It must be recognised that only 30% of the UK's population are on track to receive a moderate standard of living in retirement, both these initiatives aim to tackle this by encouraging the deployment of capital into productive assets. The Accord built on the Compact with a voluntary agreement amongst the signatories that 10% of default funds would be invested into private markets with a minimum 5% targeted towards UK based assets.

It was noted that UK pension funds are materially underweight in these asset classes compared with our international peers, many of whom are giving much better pensions to their citizens. Specifically in relation to risk, the Chairman assured Ms Hayes that as part of the City Corporation's extensive engagement with industry on this issue, pension companies' fiduciary duties to their investors were at the forefront of their minds and that remained legally binding on them; nothing in the Accord changed that. So, this was not a return to the kind of short-term, leveraged, opaque products that fuelled the 2008 financial crisis; these were instead long-term, real economy investments designed to diversify portfolios and when properly managed reduce systemic risk. It was a model that balanced fiducial duty with an appropriate risk appetite to achieve better returns for savers. Trustees will always be the ones making decisions on behalf of their Members, not the City of London Corporation or the Government.

The Chief Commoner, Deputy Henry Pollard remarked that earlier in the week he had attended a major private equity and venture capital conference, a room full of British entrepreneurs looking for investors and opportunities to grow and he believed that was what the UK needed. He asked the Chairman what we at the City Corporation was doing to create the best possible environment for the industry and savers alike.

The Chairman responded by stating that one particularly striking thing, was the appetite that schemes had for investing in the United Kingdom, particularly in private assets such as infrastructure. As to the question about what more UK capital can be

doing when the proposition is clearly so strong for others. The Mansion House Accord not only shifted the mindset into investment into higher growth assets, but it also contained a provision for half of that allocation to go into the UK in the way that our cousins in Australia and Canada have already been doing. Fundamentally within these reforms, people are investing in pensions to enjoy the retirement that they deserve but also investing into the society that they want to retire into. The Accord, and the wider pensions reforms introduced by the Government, take the City Corporation into a far more positive direction, underpinned by a far more supportive regulatory regime that encourages responsible risk taking as laid out in the Regulating for Growth Report published earlier in the year.

There were no resolutions.

13.
Resolutions

There were no docquets to be sealed.

14. Hospital
Seal

There was no Report.

15. Awards
and Prizes

16. Exclusion
of the public

*Pollard, J.H.G.,
Deputy;
Colthurst, H.N.A.,
Deputy*

Resolved - That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business below on the grounds that they either involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972; relate to functions of the Court of Common Council which are not subject to the provisions of Part VA and Schedule 12A of that Act; or relate to matters treated in confidence at the request of His Majesty's Government.

Summary of items considered whilst the public were excluded:-

Resolved – That the non-public minutes of the Court held on 24 July 2025 are correctly recorded.

17. Non-Public
Minutes

Investment Committee

18.

The Court considered a Report of the Investment Committee concerning proposals relating to a headlease variation for a City's Estate property.

Civic Affairs Sub-Committee

19.

The Court considered a Report of the Civic Affairs Sub-Committee concerning the provision of hospitality.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and ended at 2.14 pm

THOMAS.

Report of the Town Clerk to be considered in conjunction with Item 4

The Election of Chief Commoner

To be presented on Thursday, 9th October 2025

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

To elect a Chief Commoner

Two candidates, **Charles Edward Lord** and **Philip Woodhouse**, have been validly nominated in accordance with Standing Order no. 18. The candidates were invited to provide information in support of their nomination and the following submissions were received:-

Charles Edward Lord, OBE JP

After nearly twenty-five years' service, I am seeking your support to be Chief Commoner for 2026–2027. I believe I can bring experience, energy, and empathy to the role, ensuring that the Corporation does everything it can to support its Members in our broad and diverse duties.

Throughout my time here, I have made it my mission to help colleagues – new and experienced alike – navigate the often complex machinery of Guildhall, enabling them to be effective in their work for constituents and in shaping the Corporation's policy agenda. I have always sought to support Members, even when we have disagreed, because our shared purpose is to serve the City and ensure this ancient and remarkable body works as well as it can.

If elected, I will be on the side of all Members. I will continue to work to improve the facilities and services we rely on and ensure that Members' privileges are maintained and where possible enhanced. I will prioritise strengthening our training and development, enhancing the ways we can communicate with our constituents, and ensuring that grievances are dealt with swiftly and fairly.

I will work hard to support our City's leaders – the Lord Mayor and Policy Chairman – in all that they do to promote the square mile and the industries and residents we represent.

I also want to listen – to understand your hopes and frustrations, and to use my knowledge of the Corporation's procedures to help you achieve your goals. Above all, I will aim to be a sympathetic ear, a fair arbiter, and a strong advocate for elected Members.

I am honoured to have been nominated for this important civic role and hope that you will place your confidence in me when we vote at Common Council on Thursday 9 October.

Philip Woodhouse

I am honoured to stand for election as Chief Commoner. Nominated by a diverse group of colleagues, I ask for your support with humility and determination.

Over 12 years on the Court, I've seen how a good Chief Commoner makes a real difference – as sounding board, mentor, and representative. If elected, I would seek to serve members in those ways in 2026/27.

The role comes with challenges, but also opportunities to foster respect, collaboration, and inclusivity. I believe the Chief Commoner's job is to support colleagues so that each can contribute fully to the work of the Corporation and the businesses and residents we represent. That also means being willing, respectfully, to confront difficult questions when required.

My pledges

If elected, I will:

- Support members in delivering for their electorates by removing barriers to participation.
- Promote collaboration and inclusive debate – ensuring all voices are heard.
- Ensure training is up-to-date and responsive to member feedback.
- Be visible, present, and committed to members.
- Improve accountability and communication across the Court.
- Foster cohesion and inclusion, so all members feel respected and supported.
- Bring energy, humour, and perspective – because our work should be rewarding as well as serious.

About me

Elected in Langbourn in 2013, and re-elected in 2017, 2022 and 2025, I dedicate my time fully to the Court. My City career began at 14 as a messenger, later in commodity trading at ED&F Man and Tate & Lyle. I have had the privilege to chair many committees and each role has reinforced my belief that collaboration achieves results. I care deeply about the Court, and bring a pragmatic, principled, and people-focused style. With your support, we can build a more effective, inclusive Court that speaks confidently for the City.

It would be an honour to serve as your Chief Commoner.

Report – Policy & Resources Committee

Scheme of Delegations – Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation

To be presented on Thursday, 9th October 2025

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

SUMMARY

This report proposes revisions to the Court of Common Council's Officer Scheme of Delegations for the City of London Corporation, specifically to the introductory Overall Delegations to Officers section and the section in respect of the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation (CBF), to support the City Corporation in its ongoing effective administration and governance of CBF, and consistent with the City Corporation's legal obligations as Trustee of the charity. An additional amendment is proposed to the section in respect of the Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer to clarify procedure for writing off debt affecting CBF. The proposed amendments were considered and agreed by your Policy & Resources Committee at its meeting in September 2025, upon the recommendation of the CBF Board, and are therefore put to the Court of Common Council for approval.

Recommendation(s)

The Court of Common Council is recommended to:

- i) Approve the proposed amendments to the Overall Delegations to Officers and Managing Director of CBF sections of the Scheme of Delegations for recommendation to the Court of Common Council for approval;
- ii) Approve the proposed amendment to the Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer section of the Scheme of Delegations for recommendation to the Court of Common Council for approval; and
- iii) Authorise the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee, to agree any consequential amendments to the entries in respect of other Chief Officers, where these are required to give effect to the proposed amendments and/or impact on the Managing Director of CBF post.

Main Report

Background

1. The Court of Common Council has agreed the principle that authority should be delegated to Chief Officers (and their nominated Deputies or Assistants) for carrying out the day-to-day management of all City of London Corporation services

and for the discharge of specific statutory and non-statutory functions, including those for the City Corporation as trustee of CBF and other charities.

2. This authority is set out in the corporate Scheme of Delegations to Officers, establishing general conditions for the exercise of delegations and also specifying the authority delegated to each of the City Corporation's Chief Officers in the management of their departments and discharging the relevant functions, being accountable to the responsible institutional or service committee and ultimately the Court. Consequently, the Scheme of Delegation sets out the extent to which Chief Officers can take day-to-day management decisions for their department without reference to Members.
3. Being a Chief Officer post, the Managing Director of CBF has an individual entry within the Scheme of Delegations to set out their standing delegated authority for the City Corporation in the discharge of its functions as trustee of CBF without reference to the CBF Board and its Committees. The Managing Director of CBF is also the 'Head of Profession for Charities' for the City Corporation, functions for which fall under the ultimate remit of the Policy & Resources Committee.
4. The CBF Board, acting on behalf of the Court of Common Council as trustee of CBF, should be assured that CBF's decision-making processes are informed, rigorous and timely; and that effective delegation, control and risk assessment, and management systems are set up and monitored. The Charity Governance Code's recommended practice for larger charities is that the Board regularly reviews which matters are reserved to the Board and which can be delegated, and collectively exercises the powers of delegation to senior managers, committees or individual trustees, staff or volunteers. Any delegation framework should also be described in a document which provides sufficient detail on scope, and clear limitations on the exercise of the delegated authority.
5. The Policy & Resources Committee is the body responsible for the review and co-ordination of the governance of the City of London Corporation, making recommendations to the Court of Common Council as appropriate.

Current Position

6. The Managing Director of CBF's entry was added to the Scheme of Delegations following the establishment of the then-BHE Board during 2021, and the implementation of operational changes associated with a new organisational Target Operating Model (TOM) for the City Corporation in December 2020, and has not been substantively reviewed since it was initially drafted. In reporting to the Court at the time the Board was established, and previously in reporting on the new TOM for the City Corporation, it was recognised that there would be a need to update the corporate governance framework, including the Officer Scheme of Delegations, to properly reflect those agreed changes.
7. The scope of the delegations to Chief Officers set out in the Scheme of Delegations in discharging the City Corporation's functions as Trustee of CBF do not disturb the functions vested by Royal Charter, statute, common law, and custom and practice, in the ancient Offices of the City Corporation, which include the Town Clerk,

Chamberlain, Comptroller & City Solicitor and City Remembrancer. Otherwise, in administering CBF, the City Corporation may, in setting its delegation framework to officers, determine how that may be agreed in the charity's best interests.

8. In consolidating oversight of the charity's activities under one Member committee, it was recognised that the City Corporation as Trustee would also better meet its obligations to administer the charity effectively to further CBF's charitable purposes in the charity's best interests, by drawing together strategic and operational oversight of CBF's activities under one Chief Officer, accountable to the responsible Member committee. Thus, the Managing Director of CBF post has been given explicit strategic oversight of the charity's operation and activities, alongside direct responsibility for specific CBF functions. Currently, some direct responsibilities for operational CBF activities, such as engineering and investment property, remain with other Chief Officers working collegiately with the CBF Managing Director in their strategic oversight role, overseen by the CBF Board.
9. As part of an internal Governance Review of CBF, it was agreed that the corporate Scheme of Delegations entry for the Managing Director of CBF post would be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure the standing written delegations are:
 - (a) Appropriately organised to best support the effective exercise of standing delegated authority to officers in the day-to-day management of the charity in its best interests;
 - (b) Consistent with the constitutional and governance principles agreed by the Court for the good administration and management of the charity;
 - (c) Accurately reflect the decisions taken in adopting the agreed TOM and relevant departmental restructures;
 - (d) Sufficiently mindful of the need to manage conflicts of interest/loyalty in discharging the City Corporation's functions across the whole in accordance with the Conflicts of Interests Policy agreed by the Court for CBF; and
 - (e) Accounting for any changes in operation and management since the entry in the Scheme of Delegations was last formally updated.

Proposal(s)

Managing Director of CBF

10. Following review of the Scheme of Delegations, proposed revisions to the introductory Overall Delegations to Officers section and the Managing Director of CBF section are set out in **Appendix 1** to this report.
11. The proposed revisions are not intended to add new functions to the Managing Director of CBF's remit or make fundamental changes to the post, but to clarify the functions already attributed to the post and the process by which these should be discharged to support the charity's effective administration consistent with the City Corporation's duties as charity trustee, as well as to capture other ongoing standing delegations agreed separately by the CBF Board.

12. The proposed revisions are considered to support the objectives agreed by the Court as set out in paragraph 9 above. They will further the implementation of the principles agreed for the good administration and management of the charity in having CBF's fundamental strategic oversight being led by, and substantive day-to-day operation of the charity's activities being within the remit of, one department with the Managing Director of CBF, being accountable for the trustee under the oversight of the CBF Board. This is aligned to the delegation and management arrangements in place for the City Corporation's other institutions, as reported in the Court in agreeing the new TOM for the institutions, including CBF.
13. Members of the Court, and of the CBF Board, have indicated their support for increased delegation to officers to support more effective and expedient decision-making. For CBF these considerations are particularly acute with the multiple concurrent workstreams underway for CBF and for the City Corporation more generally, and as CBF activities are split across departments. Thus, it is increasingly important the Managing Director of CBF, having regard to the strategic responsibilities of his post, has proper visibility of and appropriate input into strategic decisions and decisions with significant financial implications for CBF, particularly where these involve work across City Corporation departments.

Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer

14. Additionally, an amendment is sought within the entry for the Chamberlain & Chief Financial Officer (**Appendix 2**) to ensure that procedure for the approval of debt write-offs for CBF provides for consultation with the CBF & Charities Finance Director. This amendment would rectify a discrepancy between the wording of the Scheme of Delegations and Financial Regulations, which state that write-offs relating to City Bridge Foundation should also be reported to the CBF Finance Director. The wording of the Financial Regulations will then be considered to ensure the wording is consistent at the point they are next reviewed. The Chamberlain was consulted on the proposal and is supportive of the proposed amendment.

Further Review

15. In agreeing the constitution of the then-BHE Board in 2021, the Court of Common Council authorised the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Comptroller & City Solicitor, to make any consequential changes to the City Corporation's corporate governance documents which were required to support the effective implementation of the new Board.
16. With reference to this delegation, amendments to the Scheme of Delegations entry for the Managing Director of CBF may necessitate consequential amendments to the delegations of other Chief Officers that discharge some CBF functions, such as the City Surveyor in respect of CBF property, or the Executive Director of Environment in respect of the engineering functions for the Thames bridges.
17. In support of the above, delegated authority is sought for the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chair of the Policy & Resources Committee, to agree, following further review in conjunction with other City Corporation departments, any consequential amendments to the Scheme of

Delegation sections in respect of other Chief Officers, where these are required to give effect to the proposed amendments and/or impact on the Managing Director of CBF post.

Implications

18. Strategic implications – The proposals are considered to further the outcomes of the Strategic Governance Review of BHE by ensuring that the charity's decision-making processes are sufficiently independent, conflicts of interest are managed appropriately, the Managing Director of CBF is duly consulted on decisions involving the charity, the delegation framework is clearly understood, and decision-makers are accountable. They will also support the progression of the charity's overarching *Bridging London 2020-2045* strategy by enabling strategic workstreams and in applying agreed charity strategies and policies.
19. Legal implications – The Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department have been appropriately engaged in respect of revisions both to the Managing Director of CBF's section and to the Scheme of Delegations more generally to ensure that any amendments recommended to the Court of Common Council are consistent with the City Corporation's legal responsibilities and any legal or governance restrictions in making delegations to officers.

Conclusion

20. A review and revision of the corporate Scheme of Delegations to Officers in respect of the Managing Director of CBF post has been identified as being in the best interests of the charity in its good administration and management. The proposals are considered to progress the implementation of the Court of Common Council's previous strategic decisions in respect of CBF and general governance decisions taken for the City Corporation, and will support implementation of optimal governance and management arrangements for the charity, consistent with the City Corporation's core trustee duties. Your Policy & Resources Committee therefore recommends the amendments to the Court of Common Council for approval.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Draft Revised Scheme of Delegations: Overall Delegations to Officers & Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation
- Appendix 2 – Draft Revised Scheme of Delegations: Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer

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

DATED this 18th day of September 2025.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Deputy Christopher Michael Hayward
Chairman, Policy & Resources Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

Scheme of Delegations to Officers

The General Conditions of Delegations

Overall Delegations to Officers

The Court of Common Council has agreed the principle that authority should be delegated to Chief Officers (and their nominated Deputies or Assistants) for carrying out the day-to-day management of all services and for the discharge of specific statutory and non-statutory functions, including those for the City Corporation as charity trustee.

All delegations to officers are subject to any statutory or other legal provisions which apply; the exclusion of any matters which remain for decision by the Court and/or any Committee unless specifically delegated to a particular officer; and accountability to the Court and/or any Committee in respect of decisions made under delegated authority.

All delegations to officers in accordance with the general powers detailed below are to be exercised on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the other relevant Chief Officers where appropriate and shall be deemed to be exercisable in relation to the City of London Corporation in any of its legal capacities unless otherwise specified or the context indicates otherwise.

Several senior officers are also considered Head of Profession for an Enabling Function. These officers are responsible for the management and delivery of enabling services across the City Corporation such as legal, finance, corporate communications, and HR. A Head of Profession must ensure ~~a high-quality service is delivered across the organisation through~~ the standardisation and development of their enabling service to support a high-quality services being delivered across the organisation.

Day-to-Day Management

Chief Officers (and their nominated Deputies or Assistants) are authorised to implement agreed policies and to act on the City of London Corporation's behalf in the discharge of its statutory and non-statutory functions and to exercise powers in relation to the day-to-day management of the service area for which they are responsible. (Day-to-day management should include those items which have been recognised as such by past practice or by specific decision/resolution, or where the Town Clerk, in consultation with the Chief Officers, agrees is ancillary to or analogous with matters accepted as being within the scope of day-to-day business exercisable by officers.) This includes authority to:

- a. appoint and manage staff in accordance with agreed policies and procedures, except to where this scheme of delegation indicates otherwise;
- b. undertake staff re-organisation in accordance with agreed policies and procedures and within budget limitations;

- c. place orders and enter into contracts for the supply of goods and services in line with the ~~the~~ City of London Corporation's Procurement Code, Parts 1 and 2 and to authorise or incur any other expenditure for which provision has been made in the appropriate budget or capital programme subject to limits set out in Standing Orders and Financial Regulations and subject to these not being in conflict with existing contracts:
 - Procurement Code - Part 1 – can be made available on request.
 - Procurement Code - Part 2 - can be made available on request.
- d. Manage any physical assets, including land and buildings for which the relevant Chief Officer is accountable until formally declared surplus under Standing Orders, subject always to consultation with and the approval of the City Surveyor and Executive Director Property as Head of Profession for Estates and Facilities Management and in accordance with any relevant policies and strategies in relation to property asset management.

Limitations

1. Any exercise of delegated powers by officers shall:
 - a. comply with all the ~~City of London Corporation's~~ governing or constitutional documents as relevant to the function being discharged.
 - b. comply with the City Corporation's own corporate governance framework set by or with the authority of the Court of Common Council (such as Standing Orders, the White Paper and Committee Terms of Reference, Financial Regulations, Procurement Code, Project Procedure, etc);
 - c. have regard to any agreed policies, objectives, strategies and service standards including any management directions;
 - d. have regard to the overall management and co-ordination of the work of the City Corporation and the achievement of corporate standards, as relevant;
 - e. ~~not~~ authorise expenditure only except in accordance with approved budgets, revenue estimates or capital programmes, as relevant;
 - f. not involve a new policy or extend an existing policy which has been adopted by the City Corporation (except where the Town Clerk and Chief Executive is acting in accordance with urgency powers);
 - g. be in accordance with any existing approved scheme or direction of the City Corporation, its Courts, Committees or Sub-Committees; and
 - h. be the subject of prior consultations with the appropriate Head of Profession or technical officers of the City Corporation where technical and/or professional considerations are concerned which are not within the province of, or which are shared with the Chief Officer.

- i. in respect of delegated powers exercised as charity trustee, be in the best interests of the relevant charity and in accordance with the relevant charity's own governing document.
2. Any delegation to a Chief Officer may be exercised by any officer authorised by the Chief Officer either generally or specifically for the purpose (except where restrictions exist in employment policies). The Town Clerk may exercise any function delegated to a Chief Officer at his discretion.
3. All delegation is without prejudice to the jurisdiction of the City of London Corporation its Courts, Committees or Sub-Committees. Any officer may refer a matter to a Committee or Sub-Committee in lieu of exercising delegated powers.
4. Subject to the foregoing conditions and to any special conditions which may have been or may in future be applied in respect of particular matters Chief Officers will be expected to make such decisions and to initiate such action as they deem necessary in the interests of the efficient running of their departments and the functions they discharge
5. Within their terms of delegation any reference to a statutory provision shall be deemed to refer to any statutory re-enactment or amendment of the provision.

The following powers are delegated to Chief Officers:

Expenditure

6. To incur revenue and capital expenditure and enter into commitments on behalf of the City of London Corporation where appropriate provision has been included in either the revenue or capital estimates, subject to compliance with Standing Orders, Financial Regulations, the Project Procedure and Procurement Code.
7. To authorise virement of local risk budgets in accordance with Financial Regulations, subject to the approval of the Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer.
8. To authorise projects with a total budget of up to a threshold as set out within the City of London Corporation's Projects Procedure.

Contracts

9. To approve contracts that are exempt from the Procurement Code, as referenced in the Corporate Competitive Procurement Exemption Policy (made available on request) which outlines the exemption relationship, subject to:
 - a. A £1,000,000 upper threshold;
 - b. A reporting procedure being put into place;
 - c. Officers maintaining adequate documentation, recording the detailed checks undertaken to support the approval of the contractual situation;

- d. Officers being required to declare any conflict of interest in procurement that they have no personal connection with the contractors.
10. To sign contracts, in accordance with established procedures, where the signature of the Comptroller and City Solicitor is not required.

Property

11. Subject to the prior consultation with and approval of the City Surveyor and Executive Director Property and adherence to corporate processes for Asset Management and relevant Standing Orders, and for property management services (Facilities Management, Estates Management etc.) to deal with the day-to-day management of all property and facilities under their control where specific functions have not been delegated to another officer.

Surplus Equipment

12. To dispose of surplus or obsolete vehicles, plant, apparatus, furniture, office or other books and equipment subject to any requirements laid down by the Head of Profession for Commercial Services. If the item is technology equipment, then this needs to be disposed of in line with any requirements laid down by the Head of Profession for Digital and IT.

Casual Lettings

13. Subject to the prior consultation with the City Surveyor and Executive Director Property, to approve the casual or occasional use of land, premises or equipment under the control of the responsible and/or occupying department.

Access to Information

14. To act as proper officer for the purpose of identifying background papers for reports written by the department. In the case of joint reports this role will be discharged by the Senior Officer responsible for the service.

Health and Safety

15. To be responsible for ensuring, so far as is reasonably practicable practical, the health, and safety and welfare of employees and members of the public everyone who may be affected by the work and activities of the department. Members of the Court of Common Council and the Court of Aldermen, contractors, volunteers and casual workers are all considered to be members of the public for the purposes of this requirement.
16. To comply with the City Corporation's Health and Safety Policy and standards, delegating this responsibility as appropriate in accordance with the Policy.

Heads of Profession

17. In discharging their responsibilities as set out under the Limitations at 1c.b) and 1h.g) above, to recognise the Head of Profession as the professional lead for

‘enabling functions’ (cross-cutting services that support departments in the delivery of front-line services and functions). The current list of Heads of Profession can be made available on request.

18. To consult with and support the Head of Profession in their duty to develop and maintain functional and professional standards and oversee their application through local or central resources.
19. To consult with the Head of Profession on the specific demands the department has for enabling functions, and to support the determination of appropriate delivery model(s) (either via central, shared or local resources) that will meet these needs, whilst also recognising the need to deliver high quality services, value for money and resilience for the City Corporation overall. To routinely review and revise these needs and delivery models with the Head of Profession to support continuous improvement.
20. To support the Head of Profession in the development and management of professional network(s) that draw together individuals from across the City Corporation to provide support, training and further development opportunities.
21. To consult with the Head of Profession where there are risks associated with a particular function, and to support them in the development of suitable mitigations; and where this is not effective, to proactively escalate risks to the Town Clerk and Chief Executive.

NB: For ease of reference, approval of the amendment to City Bridge Foundation of references to Bridge House Estates is assumed, the Town Clerk already having authority to make such amendments.

MANAGING DIRECTOR OF CITY BRIDGE FOUNDATION

The Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation has the following delegated authority:

Bridge House Estates (operating under the working name of City Bridge Foundation) (Charity Reg. No. 1035628)

For the City Corporation in the discharge of its functions as charity trustee of City Bridge Foundation:

General

1. To be the officer with overall strategic oversight of, and to have ultimate responsibility for, the effective and efficient administration and management of City Bridge Foundation operating as an institution within the City Corporation's corporate governance framework, in consultation with any other relevant Chief Officer having delegated authority for the discharge of specific City Bridge Foundation functions.
2. To be the officer directly responsible for the day-to-day management and administration of City Bridge Foundation other than where functions are expressly delegated to another Chief Officer: in which case they will consult with the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation.
3. In discharging the functions as provided under paragraphs 1 and 2, to be the officer responsible for overseeing the good governance and financial management of City Bridge Foundation, including investment management (of any asset type) in consultation with the Chamberlain and/or City Surveyor (or authorised delegate) to ensure that the charity's governance is fit for purpose and its finances and assets are efficiently and effectively managed in administering the charity and furthering its purposes.
4. Where authorised (whether under this Scheme of Delegations or otherwise), to sign agreements or other documents on behalf of City Bridge Foundation except where - the signature of the Comptroller and City Solicitor is required, the City Corporation's seal is required to be affixed, or another Chief Officer is authorised to act under their delegated authority in the discharge of the relevant functions.
5. To authorise expenditure from City Bridge Foundation's central contingency budget of up to £500,000.
6. In the exercise of delegated authority, including as stated under this Scheme of Delegations, to always:
 - a. act in City Bridge Foundation's best interests;

- b. act in accordance with any strategies, policies and procedures which have been adopted for the charity, and
- c. be accountable to the City Bridge Foundation Board, and any sub-committees it may establish in accordance with their terms of reference, and ultimately to the Court of Common Council.

Specific

Further to paragraph 2 above:

Operational – Bridges and Operational Property

7. To be responsible for ensuring, in consultation with any other Chief Officer in the exercise of their delegated authority, that all functions relating to the charity's primary purpose, the support and maintenance of the charity's five Bridges including highways and approaches privately maintainable by the charity, are properly discharged in the charity's best interests.
8. To take all management decisions affecting charity bridge, operational property and assets, including: intellectual property rights, use of and access to charity records and archives, use and letting of bridge property or other operational charity property within the financial limits delegated to officers taking relevant advice from other City Corporation professional officers.
9. To be responsible for the charity's tourism and educational activities undertaken at Tower Bridge and its surrounds in accordance with policies set, including to:
 - a. revise all fees and charges, including admission fees for Tower Bridge, with the discretion to reduce or waive such fees and charges in appropriate circumstances for Tower Bridge;
 - b. agree all hire charges;
 - c. negotiate and agree non-fee-based benefits for Tower Bridge in respect of filming and other production activity on or affecting the Bridge;
 - d. to negotiate and agree costs of sales and discounts in relation to the retail businesses being conducted at Tower Bridge.
10. To exercise powers under Section 29 of the Corporation of London Tower Bridge Act 1885 and Section 11 of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1971 for the opening of Tower Bridge for the navigation of vessels on the River Thames.
11. To liaise with Historic England or any other Governmental body pursuant to the provisions of any existing agreement made between the City of Corporation and Historic England or any other Governmental body relating to matters affecting Tower Bridge and its approaches.

Operational – Charitable Funding Activities

12. To be responsible for the day-to-day management and administration of the charity's funding activities in furthering the charity's ancillary purpose (including social investment), including to develop a policy for that purpose and, in doing so, to consult such persons, etc. as is deemed appropriate; and, to notify the Charity Commission of the consultation process from time to time in writing.

13. To approve or reject funding applications and social investment proposals up to the threshold agreed at which decisions should be reserved to the City Bridge Foundation Board (or, where delegated by the Board to a sub-committee).

Philanthropy & Charitable Activities - Head of Profession

14. To act as Head of Profession for the City Corporation's philanthropic and charitable activities, including grant-giving (both charitable and non-charitable) and to –
- a. provide strategic advice and guidance on philanthropy, and charitable good governance and good practice;
 - b. be responsible for the ~~Central Grants Unit~~ Funding and Charities Management Team (except the financial officers discharging the delegated authority of the Chamberlain) and oversight of the Central Grants Programme, working with the Charities Finance Team which operates under the oversight of the Charities Finance Director under Chamberlain's delegated authority;
 - c. be responsible for oversight of the implementation of the City Corporation's Benefits in Kind Policy;

Delegation to other Officers

15. The following authority is also delegated to the officers indicated to be exercised either:
- a. At the discretion of the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation or
 - b. In the absence of the Managing Director of City Bridge Foundation
 - City Bridge Foundation Chief Operating Officer/Operations Director – Items 3, 4, and 6, 7, 8
 - Director of Tower Bridge – Items 7 to 11
 - Chief Funding Director – Items 12 and 13

CHAMBERLAIN AND CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

The following powers are delegated to the Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer:

Operational

1. To be the officer responsible for the conduct of the City of London Corporation's financial affairs and, in particular, to be the proper officer for the purpose of Section 6 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.
2. In consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Resource Allocation Sub-Committee to authorise the carry forward of unspent balances within the revenue budgets.
3. To authorise all virements within locally controlled budgets.
4. To exercise such powers as may from time to time be delegated to them through the Treasury Policy Statement.
5. To authorise the payment of precepts, levies and contributions to the national non-domestic rates pool.
6. To operate market force supplements for Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer's Department staff within the set maximums.
7. To determine the financing of capital expenditure.
8. To deal with and agree claims received under the Riot (Damages) Act, 1886.
9. Approval of the Council Tax Base.
10. The write off debts due to the City of London Corporation which are irrecoverable for the following areas is delegated as follows:-
 - i) National Non-Domestic Rates/Business Improvement Districts/City Premium - up to £100,000 (Head of Financial Shared Services) and of up to £500,000 (Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer), with any amount in excess of £500,000 to be submitted to Finance Committee for approval.
 - ii) Investment Property Debt – up to £100,000 (Head of Financial Shared Services) and up to £500,000 (Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer) with any amount in excess of £500,000 to be submitted to Finance Committee or Bridge House Estates Board for approval as relevant and Property Investment Board for information (where relevant).
 - iii) All other debt types - up to £50,000 (Head of Financial Shared Services) and of up to £100,000 (Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer), with any amount in excess of £100,000 to be submitted to Finance Committee or Bridge House Estates Board for approval as relevant and to the relevant service committee for information (where relevant).
 - iv) All Small Balance write offs of any amount under £1000 (Head of Service).

- v) All write-offs affecting City Bridge Foundation should be progressed in consultation with the CBF & Charities Finance Director.

11. To write off all unclaimed credit amounts (Head of Financial Shared Services).
12. To authorise the granting of discretionary rate relief under section 47 and section 49 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 in line with the relevant government guidance or any schemes agreed by Court of Common Council, (Head of Financial Shared Services or Head of Business Rates).
13. To agree (Local Government Finance Act 1988) Section 44A Allowances (empty rate relief on partly occupied properties). (Head of Financial Shared Services or Head Business Rates).
14. To agree minor amendments to the ordinance of City Companies and Livery Companies in consultation with the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee of Aldermen.
15. To act as Head of Profession for Finance, with the right to issue technical standards and guidance in respect of such matters for use throughout the City of London Corporation and to be consulted on staffing arrangements for any of those functions within other Departments.
16. To carry out all functions in relation to Trophy Tax.
17. To sign grant claims, investment documentation and other returns on behalf of the City of London Corporation.
18. To authorise the suspension of pension contributions.

Delegations to other Officers

19. In addition to the Officers identified above, the following authorities are also delegated to other Officers identified to be exercised either:
 - a. at the direction of the Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer; or,
 - b. in the absence of the Chamberlain and Chief Financial Officer
 - Financial Services Director - Items 5, 9-12, and 14
 - Deputy Director, Financial Services } Items 5, 15 and 16
 - Corporate Treasurer }

Report – Policy and Resources Committee

Investment governance update

To be presented on Thursday 9th October 2025

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

SUMMARY

In May 2025, the Court of Common Council approved changes to the thresholds for investment property transactions as set out in Standing Orders, with the effect of raising the threshold by which transactions could be approved under officer delegation. However, the approval threshold for leasehold transactions at Standing Order 57 was omitted from these changes. Accordingly, and with the support of your Investment and Finance Committees, your Policy and Resources Committee recommends approval for additional amendments to the Standing Orders to raise the thresholds for leasehold transactions.

RECOMMENDATION

That Honourable Members agree to:

- Amend the thresholds for investment property transactions in Standing Orders as set out at paragraphs 4 and in Appendix 1.
- Authorise the Town Clerk to make the necessary amendment to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers to give effect to these changed thresholds.

MAIN REPORT

1. The thresholds for property transactions (both investment and operational) are contained at Part 9 of the Standing Orders (SO). The proposals in this report refer only to the investment property assets for City Fund and City's Estate as defined at SO 54.1 and does not include operational property assets or those managed for City Bridge Foundation.
2. In 2024, Members at various meetings directed officers to review the investment thresholds as they had stood for some time. At their February 2025 meetings, the Investment and Finance Committees and the City Bridge Foundation Board were presented with proposed revisions to the Standing Orders, as part of wider reports on investment governance and the City Bridge Foundation Board's governance arrangements respectively. They endorsed recommendations to increase the thresholds so that all transactions below £20million would be approved under delegation to officers. Transactions of £20million to less than £50million would require approval from the relevant Committees, while any transactions of £50million and over would require further approval from the Court of Common Council. This was subsequently recommended by the Policy & Resources Committee to the Court of Common Council and approved in May 2025.

3. Members supported the changes as it was felt they would allow for more dynamic management of the investment portfolios; the increased authorisation to officers would allow for decisions on property transactions to be made in a more agile manner, while still allowing Members to retain oversight of the strategic direction of the investment portfolio.
4. SO 57(1)(b) currently requires that the grant of any lease at less than full rack rent of 175 years or less is subject to the approval of the Investment Committee and Finance Committees. These thresholds were omitted from the original report in May. Accordingly, for completeness, your Investment and Finance Committees were approached to update these thresholds in line with the other rise, as outlined in Appendix 1. They endorsed a proposal to update SO 57 to allow for the grants of leases at less than full rack rental value to be delegated to officers, with any premium subject to the same thresholds as the amended thresholds detailed at paragraph 2 of this report.
5. As the Policy & Resources Committee is responsible for governance arrangements, the proposed changes were submitted to its meeting in September. The Committee agreed to recommend the amendments for approval by the Court of Common Council.

Conclusion

6. The recommended revisions, as endorsed by your Investment and Finance Committees, will support the previous changes made to the Standing Orders governing investment property transactions, which aim to provide for more agile and dynamic decision-making.

Appendices

Deletions are in the appendices are marked by being struck through; additions are underlined

- Appendix 1 – Revisions to Standing Orders

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

DATED this 18th day of September 2025.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Deputy Christopher Michael Hayward
Chairman, Policy and Resources Committee

Standing Order 57 - Leasehold Disposals/SurrendersCity Fund & City's EstateAll lettings shall be subject to the following: -

- (a) lettings for a period of 30 years or less, including lease renewals and the grant of easements, wayleaves and similar arrangements as well as all rent reviews, shall be solely subject to the approval of the Committee having control of such property or any properly authorised Officer (under the scheme of delegations): -
- (b) for City Fund and City's Estate the grant of any lease at less than full rack rental value for a period of 175 years or more (including optional extensions of term) shall require the approval of the Investment Committee (investment property assets), The grant of any lease at less than full rack rental value for a period of 175 years or less (including optional extensions of term) shall be delegated to officers. Any premium being subject to the following approvals: -

Anticipated Receipt	Approval by
Less than £20,000,000 £2,500,000	Officer Delegation
£20,000,000 to less than £50,000,000 £2,500,000 to less than £5,000,000	Investment Committee and Finance Committee
<u>£50,000,000 and above</u>	Investment Committee, Finance Committee and Court of Common Council

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – Policy and Resources Committee

Panel of Independent Persons Report

To be presented on Thursday 9th October 2025

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

SUMMARY

This report presents activity undertaken by the Panel of Independent Persons in relation to both Complaints received under the Members' Code of Conduct and applications for dispensation since May 2024. This is a report of the Independent Panel but in order to facilitate submission to the Honourable Court this day, it has been reviewed first by your Member Development and Standards Sub-Committee and your Policy and Resources Committee.

RECOMMENDATION

That Honourable Members are asked to **note** the contents of the report.

MAIN REPORT

1. The Panel of Independent Persons (The Panel) was initially established by the City of London Corporation (the Corporation) by way of Court of Common Council Resolution on 14 January 2021. This was following an independent Governance Review of the City Corporation, which proposed the establishment of an Independent Panel composed only of independent persons (convening as smaller sub-Panels of three), to receive allegations of misconduct under the Code of Conduct, determine whether to investigate, present findings to the Court, and hear any appeal. The Panel also has responsibility for making recommendations as to whether or not dispensations should be granted or refused.
2. The Panel was formally established in July 2021, initially of nine members, with a further three members approved in October 2023, to bring the Panel to a total of twelve to ensure that adequate panel members were available to cover all necessary stages of a complaint noting that no one Independent Person may sit on more than one stage of the same complaint, but also to take into account availability and any potential conflicts of interest.
3. Details of all current members of the Panel can be found at Appendix 1. The Panel's current terms of reference are attached at Appendix 2 of this report, drafted by the Panel and subsequently received by this Honourable Court in October 2022.
4. Following the resignation of two Panel Members, the Panel currently sits at ten members. During its annual meeting, the Panel agreed that two existing Independent Persons would also 'rotate off' the Panel, ending their terms at the end of 2025, and allow for the recruitment of three (now four) new Independent Persons to the Panel. A recommendation on the recruitment of four new members

of the Panel is envisaged to be presented to this Honourable Court by December 2025, following a recruitment campaign to be held over the Autumn.

5. This report is being used by the Panel as the means of communicating its activity and the activity of all Assessment, Hearing, Appeal and Dispensations Sub-panels called to sit during the period May 2024 to June 2025.

Operation of the Panel

6. The Panel operates within the framework of its terms of reference and all Panel members agree to follow the Nolan Principles and also the Code of Conduct in place for members and co-opted members of the Corporation. Each of the Panel members Register of Interests can be found online. The Panel was chaired by Amanda Orchard until June 2025, with Robert Coyle chairing the Panel from June 2025. Tom Ketteley serves as Deputy Chair from June 2025. He replaces former Deputy Chair Gary Rogers who resigned in January 2025.
7. Eight full Panel meeting have taken place since July 2021. Agendas for these meetings are approved by the Chair. All full Panel meetings have been quorate in line with the Terms of Reference. The Terms of Reference are regularly reviewed to ensure that they remain fit for purpose. The Panel currently arranges an annual meeting, with any further meetings arranged to suit organisational requirements. The Panel also take the opportunity to share best practice and undertake training relevant to their roles at full meetings. The most recent meeting was kindly hosted by the Chief Commoner in February 2025.
8. Administrative and legal support to the Panel and all sub-panels is provided through the Town Clerk's Department, and Comptroller and City Solicitor's Department, respectively. Where there may a perception that the Monitoring Officer's team might be in any way conflicted, or it is otherwise considered beneficial to obtain independent legal advice, external Counsel are called upon to assist the Panel.

Matters considered by the Panel from May 2024 – June 2025

Dispensations

9. The Panel have been asked to make recommendations on two applications for a dispensation in this reporting period. The Panel would like to use this platform to encourage all seeking dispensations to complete the necessary applications in sufficient detail with reference to the guidance provided and in sufficient time so as to enable decisions to be taken.
10. The outcome of the recommendations for all requests for a dispensation are published in the Register of Dispensations online. This also includes the certain types of straightforward requests for a dispensation that are granted by the Town Clerk via delegated authority, and those requests granted under urgency procedures by the Monitoring Officer.

Alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct

11. The Panel has considered one formal complaint in this reporting period, summarised below.

12. In accordance with the Complaints Procedure, the first determination at Assessment must be whether or not a complaint is admissible and meets the following tests:

- (i) It is a complaint against one or more named members of the Corporation;
- (ii) The named member was in office at the time of the alleged conduct and the code of conduct was in force at the time;
- (iii) The complaint, if proven, would be a breach of the code of conduct under which the member was operating at the time of the alleged misconduct;
- (iv) The complaint is about something that happened or came to light within the last three months, or is connected to alleged misconduct within the last three months, unless there are reasonable grounds for the complaint not having been made within that time period.

If the complaint fails one or more of these tests, it is deemed 'inadmissible' and cannot be investigated as a breach of the code and the complainant will be informed by the Town Clerk that no further action will be taken in respect of this complaint.

13. Should a Member be found in breach of the Code, there are a number of sanctions available to the Panel to recommend. These must be reasonable and proportionate in all of the circumstances. The available sanctions for a breach of the code of conduct are:-

- (i) censure;
- (ii) withdrawal of Corporation hospitality for an appropriate period;
- (iii) removal from one or more committees;
- (iv) other action.

14. There is no power to impose any alternative sanctions, although the willingness of a member to co-operate in the matters listed below may have a bearing on any sanction that is imposed:-

- (i) that the member submits a written apology in a form specified;
- (ii) that the member undertakes specified training;
- (iii) that the member participates in such conciliation as is specified.

Matter No.	Source of Complaint	Alleged breaches of the Code	Outcome/Status
03 - 24	Officers v Member	<i>Failing to act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias; failing to actively promote and robustly support the Nolan principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs; failing to value your colleagues and</i>	<i>An initial request for anonymity was rejected by the Assessment Panel due to a lack of exceptional circumstances. A number of named officers then came forward. The Assessment Panel</i>

		<p><i>officers of the Corporation and engage with them in an appropriate manner and one that underpins the mutual respect that is essential to good local governance; bringing your office or authority into disrepute; failing to An initial request for anonymity was rejected by the Assessment Panel due to a lack of exceptional circumstances. A number of named officers then came forward. The Assessment Panel subsequently determined that, whilst the complaint was admissible, no further action should be taken given that the Subject Member had apologised. uphold the Corporation's obligations under the Equality Act 2010 by promoting equality, and not discriminating unlawfully against any person on the grounds of race, gender, disability, religion or belief, sexual orientation or age.</i></p>	<p><i>subsequently determined that, whilst the complaint was admissible, no further action should be taken given that the Subject Member had apologised.</i></p>
--	--	--	--

Conclusion

15. Over the almost four-year period that the Panel has been active, a number of matters have been considered and refined as part of the formal Complaints Procedure now in operation, the latest of which have been presented in this report.
16. Compared to the previous year's report, the Panel have had fewer matters to consider (although the previous report covered a longer period of time). This may be connected to a successful deployment of the informal resolution mechanisms (with external mediation if agreeable by all parties) that are expressly included in the Complaints Procedure. There is also now a requirement that Member-on-Member complainants first explore a resolution with either the Chief Commoner, or the Chair of General Purposes Committee of Aldermen or the Chair of Nominations Committee of Aldermen, at an early stage.
17. The Panel's continued aim is for the complaints procedure they operate to be effective and efficient, accessible and widely understood by both members of the public and members of the Corporation alike.

Recommendation

18. We submit this report for information.

Appendices

- Appendix 1 – Panel Membership and Terms of Appointment
- Appendix 2 – Terms of Reference

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

DATED this 18th day of September 2025.

SIGNED on behalf of the Committee.

Deputy Christopher Michael Hayward
Chairman, Policy and Resources Committee

This page is intentionally left blank

PANEL MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

The current Independent Panel Members are:

Name	
Miranda Carruthers-Watt	Appointed 2021
Robert Coyle	Chair from June 2025
	Appointed 2021
Chris Fraser	<i>Until the end of 2025</i>
	Appointed 2021
Amina Hossain	Appointed 2023
Tom Ketteley	Deputy Chair from June 2025
	Appointed 2021
Karen McArthur	Appointed 2023
Amanda Orchard	Appointed 2021
Rahul Sinha	Appointed 2021
Phillip Thicknesse	<i>Until the end of 2025</i>
	Appointed 2021
Atiyyah Younis	Appointed 2021
Vacancy	
Vacancy	
Vacancy	
Vacancy	

PANEL OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS

Terms of Reference

Functions and Authority of the Panel

The Independent Persons Panel (the Panel) was established by the City of London Corporation Court of Common Council (the Corporation) by way of Court of Common Council Resolution on 14 January 2021.

The purpose and powers of the Panel is to establish and administer a Complaints Process and to also deal with the granting of Dispensations (the Scheme).

The Panel is to independently consider complaints made by anyone against an elected or co-opted member of the Corporation.

The Panel will also consider granting Dispensations for Members to participate in a particular item of business at a City Corporation meeting where a disclosable pecuniary interest exists that must be disclosed, relating to in any matter that is being considered.

The Panel has authority to develop the Policy on the process for dealing with complaints referring to any Sanctions that may be applied. The Panel is also authorised to consider Dispensations under the Scheme.

The Panel is responsible for providing from its membership, the persons to form Assessment, Hearing and Appeal Sub-panels, required to investigate and consider complaints, by informal and/or formal process under the Scheme.

The Panel considers all complaints referred to the Scheme and where formal process is followed will recommend to the Corporation the final outcome for approval. The Panel also issues the deciding determination on dispensation applications.

The Panel is responsible for developing a Policy for Publication of the outcomes of complaints, as recommended to the Corporation.

Membership

The Panel is formed of up to twelve members in total, comprised of all independent members.

All Panel members agree to follow the Nolan Principles and also the Code of Conduct in place for members and co-opted members of the Corporation.

The Panel will maintain a Register of Interests for all independent members which will be published on the City Corporation's Library webpages and updated regularly.

Independent panel members are selected by the Corporation. All appointments are for terms of up to two years, with a maximum of three terms being served.

Chair and Deputy Chair

The members of the Panel shall elect one of its members as Chair, and another member as Deputy Chair, both for a period of 12 months which can be renewed for a maximum of up to 36 months

Where the Chair is not present at a meeting, or is conflicted, the Deputy Chair will take the Chair for the meeting or for any conflicted item

Quorum, Frequency and Records of Panel Meetings

The Panel quorum is five.

The Panel will as standard meet annually each municipal year, but meetings may be cancelled or called more frequently if required.

The Panel shall hold additional meetings as required to deal with any business arising at the request of the Executive of the Corporation or at the request of two members of the Panel.

At least three weeks' notice of the time, date and venue of each Panel meeting shall be provided to all members. All relating paperwork will be issued to all no later than five clear working days before each meeting wherever possible.

It is acceptable for routine business to be conducted electronically.

The Secretariat of the Corporation will prepare minutes and provide each member with a copy. Such minutes will be reviewed at the next meeting and, subject to any amendment, agreed and will be signed by the Chair. The amendment of minutes shall not affect the validity of decisions taken by the panel in the meeting to which the minutes relate.

Duties

The Panel is responsible for establishing and maintaining a Complaints Process and applying the Sanctions Policy, both of which should be reviewed regularly

The Panel is also responsible for considering applications for dispensations submitted by Members.

The complaints process and any guidance will be available to all who want to make a complaint.

The Dispensations form and related guidance will be available to all who wish to submit an application for consideration.

The Panel, and its Sub-panels, are to have regard to the Complaints Process; any Sanctions specified in legislation or in any Sanctions Policy; the Policy and Guidance on the granting of dispensations under the Localism Act 2011; and the Members Code of Conduct when dealing with any complaints or dispensation requests before it.

All formal complaints and/or appeal recommendations will be referred to the Corporation for oversight approval. After the matter has been addressed by the Corporation the outcome will be published where the process requires this.

A recommendation or other outcome at any stage of the complaints process, will be recorded in writing and reported to the next full Panel meeting after the end of the full process for that complaint.

All determinations made by the Corporation will also be reported back to the Panel.

The Panel will adhere to best practice in terms of managing data and do so in line with the City of London Corporation Data Subject Rights Policy.

The Panel will produce an Annual Report that will be published.

Sub-Panels

Each Sub-panel will be comprised of up to three persons.

Appointments to Sub-panels will be undertaken on a rota basis. The Panel can select particular members for a complaint to replace any rota allocations, if specific skills are required to deal with a particular complaint. Also allocations should ensure, as far as possible, a mix of persons to each Sub-panel to reflect the range of diversity within the panel.

A panel member cannot be part of more than one Sub-panel for each individual complaint.

Voting mechanism

The Panel or any Sub-panel, may vote on and determine any matter arising at the meeting and each member present at the meeting shall have one vote.

Decisions of the Panel or any Sub-panel shall be by simple majority of the votes cast (excluding any abstentions).

Approved February 2025.

Report – Finance Committee

Get Britain Working Trailblazer – Full Potential – Novation to the City of London Corporation

To be presented on Thursday 11th October 2025

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

SUMMARY

This report concerns the City of London Corporation's role as contracting authority on behalf of Central London Forward (CLF). At the request of CLF, it seeks the requisite approvals to move 'Full Potential' (one of five Get Britain Working Trailblazer programmes funded by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), via the Greater London Authority (GLA)) from the London Borough of Camden, to the City of London Corporation.

This means agreeing a novation of the agreements between the GLA and Camden. These agreements follow a prescribed and standard form reflect funding from the DWP.

In addition, your Finance Committee also recommends the Court approves receipt of £15m of additional funding and the activities associated with running the programme for a further 3 years at a cost of £5m per year.

As with previous approvals concerning CLF, a Court of Common Council decision is required to passport any such recommendations proposed by the CLF Board and approved by your Finance Committee.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Court of Common Council:-

- Approves novation of the agreement between the GLA and the London Borough of Camden, and the agreements between the London Borough of Camden and the other CLF member authorities in relation to this Programme.
- Approves the acceptance of funding from the GLA and/or the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) for an extension of and growth within the 'Full Potential' Get Britain Working Trailblazer programme, up to a total value of £15m for delivery between April 2026 and March 2029, and endorsement of the subsequently required contractual amendments or variations.
- Approves novation of the agreement between the London Borough of Camden and the Learning and Work Institute for the evaluation of this programme, and

the extension of that agreement to cover the extended programme period, to March 2029.

- Delegates authority to the Chamberlain and Executive Director, Innovation and Growth, with support from the Comptroller & City Solicitor's Department to finalise and enter into the relevant contractual information.

MAIN REPORT

Background

1. 'Full Potential' is one of five Get Britain Working Trailblazer programmes funded by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), via the Greater London Authority (GLA). The Trailblazers were originally designed to be one-year, test-and-learn programmes aiming to bring together services and test new approaches.
2. Full Potential is focused on young people with experience of the care system.
3. Ordinarily, the City of London Corporation acts as the contracting authority on behalf of Central London Forward (CLF). On this occasion the London Borough of Camden took on a coordinating role funding was offered and the programme designed in just three months, with the approvals being required during the time when the City of London Corporation was having its elections.
4. Published in late November 2024, the Government's Get Britain Working White Paper set out their proposals to reform employment, health and skills support to tackle economic inactivity and support people into good work. The white paper announced ambitions to reduce NHS waiting lists, reforms to Jobcentre Plus to increase the focus on careers and work rather than on administering benefits, the creation of a new national jobs and careers service, a greater focus on digital services in the employment and skills support system and a goal to create an inclusive labour market where everyone can participate and progress in work, aiming for an 80% employment rate within a decade.
5. The White Paper also set out plans for Trailblazer areas to bring together services and test new approaches, supported by £240million of investment.
6. Five Trailblazers will be delivered in London with the Greater London Authority acting as accountable body. Three focus broadly on economic inactivity, and two on delivering the Youth Guarantee:
 - a. One pan-London Trailblazer providing systems leadership and change in the youth employment, education and training (EET) and wraparound support space. This Trailblazer will also deliver discrete transitions, mental health, and youth participation focused pilots with the geographic specifics of delivery identified through mapping and data analysis conducted through set-up grant funding. Finally, resource within this Trailblazer will deliver a pan-London convening and coordination function for all four sub-regional Trailblazers across both youth and economic inactivity. London government partners want to ensure that all Trailblazer activity is coordinated to maximise the capital's allocation.

- b. One Trailblazer focusing on care leavers aged 17-25 years old, delivered by CLF. It is this Trailblazer – now called Full Potential - that is the subject of this report.

7. Full Potential will support over 1,000 care-experienced young people

Current Position

8. Working with Camden and our other member authorities, CLF has already begun delivering the Full Potential programme. The programme aims to:
 - Support care leavers in central London to progress toward and move into employment, education and training;
 - Build capacity through helping boroughs and other stakeholders to innovate, to work together, and to learn from each-other;
 - Build the evidence base about what works in supporting care leavers into employment, education and training
9. The exact interventions vary across boroughs but essentially provides intensive support from a personal advisor with a low caseload and work closely with employers to identify employment opportunities and provide pastoral support on the transition into work. There will be an intermediate labour market element, providing subsidised temporary roles, paid at least the London Living Wage, to give care leavers real-world experience. It is likely that at least one of those intermediate roles will be hosted by CLF itself, to demonstrate leadership in this area and to contribute in a new way.
10. Full Potential focuses on the following outcomes:
 - Number of care leavers engaged;
 - Care leavers supported into sustainable work;
 - Care leavers supported into education and training;
 - Increased confidence and employability of care leavers
11. CLF has procured, through a competitive process, the Learning and Work Institute to act as the evaluation partner for this programme, as per the GLA's requirements. The Learning and Work Institute is now in contract with Camden (on behalf of CLF).
12. There were some delays in programme delivery beginning as the GLA and DWP negotiated the legal agreements, and these were cascaded down to delivery partners. This means that year one delivery is challenging, but this is being managed, and CLF is confident that it will deliver the relevant outcomes.
13. A three-year funding extension has been announced, but the full detail is not confirmed at this stage. Previous experience of this programme demonstrates that decisions will be made with very short lead-in or preparation time, and therefore approval for a funding envelope is sought at this stage to maximise efficiency and delivery time.

14. CLF's preference is therefore to bring the programme back in line with its usual governance arrangements for the duration. This means agreeing a novation of the agreements between the GLA and Camden. These agreements follow a prescribed and standard form reflect funding from the DWP.

Options

15. Do not approve: the most likely outcome of this is that the programme will continue to run with Camden acting as the contracting body on behalf of CLF. Such action however undermines a functional status quo that CLF has developed over a number of years and adds operational complexity to an already complex programme and delivery structure. This option was considered but not supported by your Finance Committee
16. Approve: such decision would bring governance of this important programme to the City of London Corporation in line with other CLF programmes and ensure consistency across CLF programmes. This recommendation was supported by your Finance Committee and is before you this day, to agree.

Proposals

17. The arrangement for Camden to be the contracting body for this programme was made for the purposes of expediency, and to ensure that CLF did not miss out on this funding due to the City of London Corporation elections.
18. These proposals therefore bring Full Potential back in line with CLF's usual governance processes in time for plans to be made for delivery of the extended programme.

Key Data

19. There are 19,000 Care Experienced young people in London aged 17-25.
20. Care leavers face significant social and economic disadvantage and experience substantially worse outcomes than other young people:
- a. Care leavers aged 19-21 are over three times more likely to be NEET.
 - b. Care leavers are around four times more likely to have a mental Health disorder.
 - c. Care leavers are more likely to lack of formal qualifications, and to have unstable housing, which acts as a barrier to education and employment.

Corporate and Strategic Implications

Strategic implications

21. The funding will support the following outcomes of the City of London's Corporate Plan; Diverse and engaged communities; Dynamic economic growth; Providing excellent services.

Financial implications

22. There are no financial implications for the City Corporation. All programme costs, including management costs, are met by the funding from the DWP (via the GLA).

Resource implications

23. The resource implications for the City Corporation are very limited. CLF is supported by colleagues within Innovation and Growth, Comptroller's and Chamberlain's. Services from Comptroller's and Chamberlain's are recharged internally, so the cost is met from CLF budgets.

Legal implications

24. There are legal implications in that this paper seeks approval for the novation of legal agreements to the City of London Corporation, but there are no implications beyond what is usual for CLF contractual arrangements.

25. The suggested approach is compliant with Section 1 of the Localism Act and There are no legal implications. Extending the contract is permissible under Reg 72(1)(b) of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

Risk implications

26. There are risks inherent in programme delivery, but CLF's work is managed and scrutinised regularly by its own Board, which mitigates risk to the City of London Corporation by providing another layer of senior-level oversight. Payment risk is limited on this programme as payment is made in arrears and on the basis of evidenced allowable spend.

Equalities implications

27. CLF specifically works to tackle labour market inequalities and support residents with protected characteristics into good jobs. The Full Potential programme specifically works to address the challenges of care-experienced young people. Experience of care is designated by some authorities as a protected characteristic in itself.

Climate implications

28. There are no specific climate implications.

Security implications

29. There are no security implications.

Conclusion

30. The extension of the Trailblazer programme by DWP offers an opportunity to increase the reach and effectiveness of this test-and-learn programme. In order to take full advantage of that opportunity, CLF seeks approval via this Report to bring the programme in line with existing governance arrangements.

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

DATED this 16th day of September 2025.

SIGNED on behalf of the Finance Committee.

Deputy Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst
Chairman, Finance Committee

This page is intentionally left blank



List of Applications for the Freedom

To be presented on Thursday 9th October, 2025

*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.

Professor Salma Yasmin Abbasi <i>David James Sales, CC</i> <i>Nicholas James Redgrove</i>	a Science & Technology Company Founder <i>Citizen and Insurer</i> <i>Citizen and Insurer</i>	Westminster, London
Alison Elisabeth Maria Thaddea Abensperg Und Traun <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Homemaker <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Gross Schweinbarth, Austria
Count Benedikt Andreas Abensperg Und Traun <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	an Entrepreneur <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Gross Schweinbarth, Austria
Chian Tat Ah Teck <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	an Investment Company Chairman <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Westminster, London
Dr Ibrahim Saad Ibrahim Abdulaziz Almojel <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Holding Company Founder & Partner <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Alexander Henry Fenwick Armstrong <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Ald. Sheriff Gregory Percy Jones, KC</i>	a Television & Radio Presenter <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Leatherseller</i>	Oxford, Oxfordshire

Dawn Ann Bartlett <i>Marianne Bernadette Fredericks, Deputy Ald. Sir William Anthony Bowater Russell</i>	a Project Manager <i>Citizen and Baker</i> <i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i>	Cambridgeshire
Andrew Philip Bates <i>Robert Maurice Andrews</i> <i>Jeffrey Richard Lewis</i>	an Insurance Broker <i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Uxbridge, Ontario, Canada
Brian John Bishop <i>Kristen James Cottier</i> <i>David John Parkins</i>	a Business Analyst, retired <i>Citizen and Spectacle Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Spectacle Maker</i>	Bexley, London
Daniel Moran Bricken <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Food Company Director <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Hammersmith & Fulham, London
Gail Campbell <i>Nigel Morris Berman</i> <i>Yvonne Charlotte Margaret Morrissey</i>	an Investment Bank Director, retired <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Barber</i>	Kensington & Chelsea, London
David Howarth Chapman <i>Rafael Steinmetz Leffa</i> <i>Jago Toner</i>	a Programme Director <i>Citizen and International Banker</i> <i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	Southampton, Hampshire
John Gordon Cluff, OBE DL <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Mining Company Chairman <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Dover, Kent
His Excellency Vikram Kumar Doraiswami <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Christopher Michael Hayward, Deputy</i>	a Diplomat <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Westminster, London
Her Excellency Hélène Julia Émilie Caroline Duchêne <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Christopher Michael Hayward, Deputy</i>	a Diplomat <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Kensington & Chelsea, London
Alexandre Rodrigues Frota <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Jewellery Company Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Westminster, London

Reverend Paul Arthur Gismondi <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Clerk in Holy Orders <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Norfolk
Sarah Kate Gosling <i>Ald. Timothy Russell</i> <i>Hailes, JP</i> <i>Madush Gupta, CC</i>	a Charity Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Grantham, Lincolnshire
Alexandra Lilian Hovius-Náray <i>Matthew Richard Hovious</i> <i>Nigel Paul Harding</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	Budapest, Hungary
Andrew Howard <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Lecturer and Jewellery Consultant <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Stourbridge, West Midlands
Harjeev Singh Kandhari <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	an Entrepreneur <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Haringey, London
Professor Sir Nasser David Khalili <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Scholar, Art Collector & Philanthropist <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Westminster, London
Emily Georgia Knight <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Jeweller <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Warwickshire
The Revd Timothy John Nicholas L'estrage <i>Dep. Christopher Michael Hayward</i> <i>Matthew Damian Hampson</i>	a Clerk in Holy Orders <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i>	Ealing, London
Tik Pong Martin Man <i>Craig Stuart Philip Harding</i> <i>Richard Gary Stephen Miller</i>	a Wireless Solutions Company Managing Director <i>Citizen and Constructor</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Bristol
Ramsey Neal Mankarious <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Sophia Abigail Mooney, CC</i>	a Hotel Investor <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Camden, London

Major Michael McCarthy, MBE <i>Colonel (retd) James William Denny, MBE</i> <i>Michael John Dudding, OBE, TD</i>	a Civil Servant <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and Chartered Secretary & Administrator</i>	Bedfordshire
Kevin Douglas McOwan <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	a Property Sales Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Dorking, Surrey
Figen Ayse Murray, OBE <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Russell Penny</i>	a Campaigner <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	Cheshire
Samantha Christina Orozco <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i> <i>Samapti Bagchi, CC</i>	a Capital Markets Executive Director <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Wandsworth, London
Michael James Phillis <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Ald. Sheriff Gregory Percy Jones, KC</i>	a Barrister <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Leatherseller</i>	Lambeth, London
Isobel Lily Potter <i>John Alexander Smail</i> <i>Dr Shirin Parsno</i>	a Lifeguard <i>Citizen and Distiller</i> <i>Citizen and Apothecary</i>	Loughborough, Leicestershire
David Andrew Prashner <i>James Michael Douglas Thomson, CBE, Deputy Ald. Elizabeth Anne King, BEM, JP</i>	a City of London Police Officer, retired <i>Citizen and Grocer</i> <i>Citizen</i>	Epping Forest, Essex
Michael Stuart Rayner <i>Madush Gupta, Deputy Ald. Timothy Russell Hailes, JP</i>	a Bank Senior Integrator <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Dorset
Sir Arthur Gareth Ludovic Emrys Rhys Williams, CB <i>Jeremy Mark Fox</i> <i>Peter James Bottomley</i>	a Transport Company Chairman <i>Citizen and Stationer & Newspaper Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Draper</i>	Hammersmith & Fulham, London
Sébastien Rousseau <i>Paul Victor Holmes</i> <i>Mark Robert Jason Eyles-Thomas</i>	a Banker <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i> <i>Citizen and Security Professional</i>	Barnet, London
Kalle Juhani Salminen <i>Ald. Prem Babu Goyal, CBE</i> <i>Vladislav Dobrokhoto</i>	an Entrepreneur <i>Citizen and Goldsmith</i> <i>Citizen and Marketor</i>	Helsinki, Finland

Lord Sarfraz of Kensington Aamer Ahmad Sarfraz <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Christopher Michael Hayward, Deputy</i>	a Peer of the Realm <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Kensington & Chelsea, London
Olu Shonubi <i>Peter John Neal</i> <i>Patrick John Carroll</i>	a Film & Documentary Writer <i>Citizen and Plaisterer</i> <i>Citizen and Plaisterer</i>	Hackney, London
John Edward Taylor <i>Colin Trevor Gurnett</i> <i>John Charles Jordan</i>	an Electrician, retired <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Loughton, Essex
Dr Paul Alexander Taylor <i>Madush Gupta, Deputy</i> <i>Ald. Timothy Russell</i> <i>Hailes, JP</i>	a Software Development Company Chief Executive <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Weybridge, Surrey
Lieutenant-Colonel Sir James Michael Vernon, KCVO <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>James Henry George Pollard, Deputy</i>	Lord Chamberlain's Office's Comptroller, retired <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Skinner</i>	Duns, Berwickshire
Helen Mary Robertson Waldron <i>John Alexander Smail</i> <i>Dr Shirin Parsno</i>	a Teacher, retired <i>Citizen and Distiller</i> <i>Citizen and Apothecary</i>	Loughborough, Leicestershire
Lucy Jennifer Robertson Waldron <i>John Alexander Smail</i> <i>Dr Shirin Parsno</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Distiller</i> <i>Citizen and Apothecary</i>	Loughborough, Leicestershire
Paul Douglas Whitehead <i>Ald. Timothy Russell</i> <i>Hailes, JP</i> <i>James Michael Douglas Thomson, CBE, Deputy</i>	a Knowledge of London Examiner, retired <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Bexley, London
Daniel Bryan Wilkinson-Horsfield <i>Hannah Siobhan Moxon</i> <i>Gerald Michael Edwards</i>	a Property Operations Director <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i> <i>Citizen and Fruiterer</i>	Salisbury, Wiltshire
Harriet Vanessa Elizabeth Winters <i>Madush Gupta, Deputy</i> <i>Ald. Timothy Russell</i> <i>Hailes, JP</i>	a Banking Product Owner <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i> <i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	Lambeth, London

This page is intentionally left blank

Motion – by Leyla Boulton

To be presented on Thursday 9th October 2025

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

Motion:-

"Given:

That everywhere else in the United Kingdom, rolling electoral registers allow new electors to be added monthly, ensuring registers remain up to date and inclusive;

That the City of London is the only place in the country where this system does not apply, with the electoral register updated only once a year;

That a lack of rolling registers means that any number of new constituents can be disenfranchised and any number who have left a ward can still vote there, undermining democracy;

That an unnecessary bureaucratic burden is imposed on businesses, which must draw up new voter lists every year instead of simply adding and removing voters as the need arises; and

That the electoral services department already maintains a rolling register for residents as part of its obligations for parliamentary elections.

This Honourable Court resolves:-

To instruct officers to bring forward a report to the Policy & Resources Committee setting out the necessary steps to achieve legislative change at the earliest opportunity to introduce rolling electoral registration in the City of London Corporation."

Signatories to the Motion, pursuant to Standing Order 12(2) and 12(3):-

Leyla Boulton (*Mover*)
Mercy Haggerty (*Seconder*)
Mark Wheatley
Deputy Anne Corbett
Sandra Jenner

Adam Hogg
Deborah Oliver
Timothy McNally
Deputy Peter Dunphy
Josephine Hayes

This page is intentionally left blank

Report – City Remembrancer

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

To be presented on Thursday, 9th October 2025

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

Statutory Instruments

Hazards in Social Housing (Prescribed Requirements) (England)
Regulations 2025

In Force

27th October
2025

For social homes, implies into the lease of a social home, a covenant that the registered provider of social housing will address hazards (such as damp and mould) that affect or may affect the social home, within certain timeframes – several categories are set out. In standard cases, for instance, investigations must take place within 10 working days of the date the landlord becomes aware of the issue. The investigation must be completed by someone competent and can generally be completed in any way (i.e. physically or remotely). The Regulations set out detailed schemes for how investigations by landlords should be conducted. The substance of this Regulation is known colloquially as Awaab's Law.

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

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 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, 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