



ESTLIN, MAYOR

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

10th January 2019
MEMBERS PRESENT

ALDERMEN

Emma Edhem
The Rt. Hon. the Lord Mayor, Alderman Peter Estlin
John Garbutt
Sir Roger Gifford
Alison Gowman
Prem Goyal OBE JP
David Andrew Graves

Timothy Russell Hailes JP
Robert Picton Seymour Howard
Robert Charles Hughes-Penney
Gregory Jones QC
Sheriff Vincent Thomas Keaveny
Alastair John Naisbitt King
Ian David Luder JP

Professor Michael Raymond Mainelli
Sir Andrew Charles Parmley
William Anthony Bowater Russell
Sir David Hugh Wootton
Sir Alan Colin Drake Yarrow

COMMONERS

George Christopher Abrahams
Munsur Ali
Randall Keith Anderson
Thomas Alexander Anderson
Alexander Robertson Martin Barr
Douglas Barrow
Adrian Mark Bastow
Matthew Bell
John Bennett, Deputy, MBE
Peter Gordon Bennett
Nicholas Michael Bensted-Smith, JP
Sir Mark Boleat
Mark Bostock
Keith David Forbes Bottomley, Deputy
David John Bradshaw, Deputy
Tijs Broeke
Michael John Cassidy, Deputy
Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick, OBE, Deputy
John Douglas Chapman
Thomas Cowley Clementi

Henry Nicholas Almroth Colthurst
Simon D'Olier Duckworth, OBE
Peter Gerard Dunphy
Mary Durcan
Kevin Malcolm Everett
Anne Helen Fairweather
Sophie Anne Fernandes
John William Fletcher
Marianne Bernadette Fredericks
Caroline Wilma Haines
Graeme Harrower
Christopher Michael Hayward
Christopher Hill
Tom Hoffman, Deputy, MBE
Ann Holmes
Michael Hudson
Wendy Hyde, Deputy
Jamie Ingham Clark, Deputy
Clare James, Deputy
Henry Llewellyn Michael Jones, Deputy

Shravan Jashvantrai Joshi
Angus Knowles-Cutler
Tim Levene
Vivienne Littlechild JP, MBE
Oliver Arthur Wynlayne Lodge
Edward Lord, OBE, JP, Deputy
Paul Nicholas Martinelli
Andrew Paul Mayer
Jeremy Mayhew
Catherine McGuinness, Deputy
Andrew Stratton McMurtrie, JP
Wendy Mead, OBE
Robert Allan Merrett, Deputy
Brian Desmond Francis Mooney, Deputy
Hugh Fenton Morris, Deputy
Sylvia Doreen Moys, MBE
Benjamin Daniel Murphy
Joyce Carruthers Nash, OBE, Deputy
Barbara Patricia Newman, CBE
Susan Jane Pearson

John Petrie
William Pimlott
James Henry George Pollard, Deputy
Jason Paul Pritchard
Stephen Douglas Quilter,
Elizabeth Rogula, Deputy
James de Sausmarez
Ruby Sayed
John George Stewart Scott, JP,
Ian Christopher Norman Seaton
Oliver Sells QC
Jeremy Lewis Simons
Tom Sleigh, Deputy
Graeme Martyn Smith
James Michael Douglas
Thomson, Deputy
John Tomlinson, Deputy
James Richard Tumbridge
William Upton
Mark Raymond Peter Henry
Delano Wheatley
Philip Woodhouse, Deputy

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

2. Declarations Deputy Robert Merrett declared an interest in respect of Item 21 by virtue of the fact that his daughter was a pupil at the City of London School for Girls.

3. Minutes *Resolved* – That the Minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.
4. Resolutions
Scott, J.G.S.,
J.P.; Mayhew,
J.P. *Resolved unanimously* – That the sincere congratulations of this Court be offered to
John Alfred Bennett, MBE
on his recent appointment by Her Majesty the Queen as a Member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, in recognition of service to the City of London Corporation and to education.
Deputy Bennett was heard in reply.
The Chief Commoner also took the opportunity to congratulate William Upton on his forthcoming appointment as a Queen's Council.
5. Mayoral
Visits The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor reported on his recent visits to Vancouver, San Francisco and Mexico City.
6. Policy
Statement There was no Statement.
7. Hospital
Seal There were no docquets for the seal.
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:-
- | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Calum Maccalman
<i>John Alexander Smail</i>
<i>John Donald Lunn</i> | an Architectural Company Director
<i>Citizen and Distiller</i>
<i>Citizen and Fan Maker</i> | Bearsden, Scotland |
| Timothy Guy Hartley
<i>Michael Cleobury Thatcher</i>
<i>Alistair Edward Telfer</i> | a Barrister
<i>Citizen and Glover</i>
<i>Citizen and Musician</i> | Tholthorpe, York,
Yorkshire |
| Christine Ellen Neale
<i>Graham John Peacock</i>
<i>Richard Eaglesfield Floyd</i> | a Court Dressmaker, retired
<i>Citizen and Loriner</i>
<i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i> | Hornchurch, Essex |
| Lucy Ann Baker
<i>Graham John Peacock</i>
<i>Richard Eaglesfield Floyd</i> | an Administrative Officer
<i>Citizen and Loriner</i>
<i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i> | Sidcup, Kent |
| Taylor Allene Hunt
<i>David Blake</i>
<i>Benjamin David Oliver Blake</i> | a Marketing and Public Relations
Manager
<i>Citizen and Mason</i>
<i>Citizen and Mason</i> | Bow, London |
| Halina Watson | a Teacher, retired | Kettering, |

<i>David Charles Watson</i> <i>Jonathan Grosvenor</i>	<i>Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i> <i>Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i>	Northamptonshire
Anthony Paul Disley <i>Stephen Lawrence Purdy</i> <i>Ivor Macklin</i>	an Engineer <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer</i> <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer</i>	Wickford, Essex
Abigail Jean Blessing <i>William Barrie Fraser, OBE</i> <i>Sir Andrew Charles Parmley, Ald.</i>	an Academy Vice Principal <i>Citizen and Gardener</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	East Dulwich, Southwark
Stefan Urs Breu <i>Paul Barrow-Longain</i> <i>William Alfred Hackett</i>	a Real Estate Manager <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i> <i>Citizen and Firefighter</i>	Wil, Switzerland
Dr Fozia Sadiq, JP <i>Jason Pritchard, CC</i> <i>Munsur Ali, CC</i>	a Social Action Consultant <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	Croydon, Surrey
Paul Leslie Taylor <i>Peter Rupert David Wood</i> <i>Trevor George Lord</i>	a Building Wholesalers Managing Director <i>Citizen and Feltmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Feltmaker</i>	Ipswich, Suffolk
Dr Nicholas George Jeremy Gaze <i>Maurice Bernard Greenberg</i> <i>Joseph Larry Herzberg</i>	a Senior Technical Lead <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Apothecary</i>	Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire
Richard Ernest Abbott <i>Ernest Charles Peter Abbott</i> <i>Alan Robert Brumwell</i>	an Insurance Broker <i>Citizen and Plumber</i> <i>Citizen and Plumber</i>	Ockendon, Essex
Christopher Andrew Hughes <i>Diana Mary Hughes</i> <i>David William Henderson-Begg</i>	a Journalist <i>Citizen and Tin Plate Worker alias Wire Worker</i> <i>Citizen and Tin Plate Worker alias Wire Worker</i>	Ashtead, Surrey
Keith Andrew Godbee <i>Peter Desmond Robinson</i> <i>Michael Ian Godbee</i>	a Chartered Accountant, retired <i>Citizen and Butcher</i> <i>Citizen and Tax Adviser</i>	Blackmore, Essex
Susan Carolyn Neville <i>Walter Balmford</i> <i>Joyce Carruthers Nash, OBE, Deputy</i>	a Practice Manager <i>Citizen and Lightmonger</i> <i>Citizen and Feltmaker</i>	Upton Park, Newham
Graham Edward Lilly <i>Frederick Joseph Trowman</i> <i>Richard Charles Clinton Fynes</i>	a Chartered Surveyor, retired <i>Citizen and Loriner</i> <i>Citizen and Framework Knitter</i>	South Croydon, Surrey
Stanley Hodges <i>Charles Edward Beck Bowman, Ald.</i> <i>Michael Brett Hockney, MBE</i>	a Company Chairman <i>Citizen and Grocer</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Standon, Hertfordshire
Steven Prior O'Connor	a Charity Chief Executive Officer	Henley-on-Thames, Oxfordshire

<i>Edward Arthur Jackson</i>	<i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	
<i>Matthew Henry Dymott</i>	<i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	
Professor David Alan Brodie	a Professor, retired	Chalfont St Peter, Buckinghamshire
<i>Richard Anthony Stone</i>	<i>Citizen and Glazier</i>	
<i>Trevor James Arthur Newey</i>	<i>Citizen and Glazier</i>	
Guinevere Elaine Foley, TD	a Registered Nurse, retired	Bromley, Kent
<i>Col. Jane Carey-Harris, TD</i>	<i>Citizen and Apothecaries</i>	
<i>Col. Jane Davis, OBE QVRM TD DL</i>	<i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	
<i>RGN</i>		
Father Paul Anthony Kyne	a Catholic Priest	Westminster, London
<i>Stephen Decatur Haines, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Pewterer</i>	
<i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	
Elizabeth Mary Walsh Maclean	a Marketing Company Director, retired	Sennybridge, Wales
<i>David Anthony Barrett</i>	<i>Citizen and Coachmaker & Coach</i>	
<i>Andrew Ronald Macgavin Maclean</i>	<i>Harness Maker</i>	
	<i>Citizen and Maker of Playing Cards</i>	
Frank William Durham	a Journalist, retired	Badgers Mount, Kent
<i>Alan Stanley Cook</i>	<i>Citizen and Gunmaker</i>	
<i>Deborah Jane Black</i>	<i>Citizen and Educator</i>	
Michael Josephson, MBE	a Retail Wholesaler Company Director	Alderley Edge, Cheshire
<i>Richard Craig Duncaif, OBE, JP</i>	<i>Citizen and World Trader</i>	
<i>Professor Vikas Sayar Shah, MBE</i>	<i>Citizen and Launderers</i>	
Arturo Ramirez Jr	a Warden	Datchet, Berkshire
<i>Col. David Robin Axson</i>	<i>Citizen and Turner</i>	
<i>Sqn. Ldr. Antony Christopher Harley</i>	<i>Citizen and Educator</i>	
<i>Farnath</i>		
Nikolaos Papadellis	a Management Consultant	Putney, London
<i>Gareth Wynford Moore</i>	<i>Citizen and Joiner</i>	
<i>William Frederick Payne</i>	<i>Citizen and Joiner</i>	
Paul Victor Dedman, MBE	an Electricity Co. Head of Transmission, retired	Beeding Steyning, West Sussex
<i>Harold Ebenezer Piggott</i>	<i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	
<i>Paul Stephen Hollebone</i>	<i>Citizen and Chartered Accountant</i>	
Jane Lesley Ball	a Deputy Head Teacher, retired	Knockholt, Kent
<i>Alan Stanley Cook</i>	<i>Citizen and Gunmaker</i>	
<i>Deborah Jane Black</i>	<i>Citizen and Educator</i>	
Andrew John Kidd	a Solicitor	Islington, London
<i>Alexander John Cameron Deane</i>	<i>Citizen and Currier</i>	
<i>Stephen Paul Tanner</i>	<i>Citizen and Upholder</i>	
Sebastian Blomeier	a Solicitor	Tower Hamlets, London
<i>Mark John Herbage</i>	<i>Citizen and Cook</i>	
<i>Sarah Jane Fletcher Harris</i>	<i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	
Professor James Michael Lynch, OBE	a Professor	Angmering On Sea, West Sussex

<i>Wendy Mead, OBE, CC</i> <i>Patricia Agnes Campfield, MBE</i>	<i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	
Christopher James	a Project Manager, retired	Old Leake, Lincolnshire
<i>Geoffrey Douglas Ellis</i> <i>Wesley Val Hollands</i>	<i>Citizen and Joiner</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	
Sara Nicola Russell	a College Principal	Spencers Wood, Berkshire
<i>Peter Francis Clark</i> <i>Gerald Michael Edwards</i>	<i>Citizen and Mason</i> <i>Citizen and Fruiterer</i>	
Nicholas Charles Gunyon	a Chef and Lecturer	Upminster, Essex
<i>Mark Anthony Grove</i> <i>David Andrew Harry McGregor Smith,</i> <i>CBE</i>	<i>Citizen and Cook</i> <i>Citizen and Cook</i>	
Sharon Margaret Barry	an Educator	Eaton Socon, Cambridgeshire
<i>Mark Anthony Grove</i> <i>David Andrew Harry McGregor Smith,</i> <i>CBE</i>	<i>Citizen and Cook</i> <i>Citizen and Cook</i>	
Kenneth Frederick David Bushnell	a Local Government Officer, retired	Waterlooville, Hampshire
<i>William James Murray</i> <i>Terence Harragan</i>	<i>Citizen and Feltmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Feltmaker</i>	
Philip Robert Anderson	a Regular Army Officer	West Hampstead, London
<i>Phillip John Davis</i> <i>Daniel Mark Heath</i>	<i>Citizen and Hackney Carriage Driver</i> <i>Citizen and Hackney Carriage Driver</i>	
Nick Mitchell	a Royal Navy Auxiliary Seaman	York, North Yorkshire
<i>Michael Richard Adkins</i> <i>Stanley Brown, QGM, TD</i>	<i>Citizen and Water Conservator</i> <i>Citizen and Loriner</i>	
Mark Clitherow	a Banker	Watford, Hertfordshire
<i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i> <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i>	<i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	
Christine Bernadette Sanders	a Personal Assistant, retired	Surrey Quays, London
<i>Jeremy Lewis Simons, CC</i> <i>Wendy Mead, OBE, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Scientific Instrument Maker</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	
Heather Mae Rawlins	a Livery Company Steward	Walworth, London
<i>Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick, OBE,</i> <i>Deputy</i> <i>Anne Helen Fairweather, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Bowyer</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	
Janice Margaret Clegg	a Livery Company Personal Assistant	Patching, West Sussex
<i>Alison Jane Gowman, Ald.</i> <i>James Henry George Pollard, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Skinner</i>	
Clarisse Aude Tavin Saureux	an Architect	Hackney, London

<i>Alison Jane Gowman, Ald.</i>	<i>Citizen and Glover</i>	
<i>Mark Raymond Peter Wheatley, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Draper</i>	
Margaret Joy Campbell	a Livery Company Clerk	Notting Hill, London
<i>John David Absalom, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Butcher</i>	
<i>Sir Clive Martin, OBE, TD, DL</i>	<i>Citizen and Stationer & Newspaper Maker</i>	
Margaret Anne Virginia Game	an Ecologist, retired	Highgate, London
<i>Jeremy Lewis Simons, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Scientific Instrument Maker</i>	
<i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	
Alexandra Frances Jackson	a Fund Manager	Fulham, London
<i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i>		
<i>Robert Charles Hughes-Penney</i>	<i>Citizen and Haberdasher</i>	
Kate Laura Royal	an Opera Singer	Peckham, London
<i>Jeremy Lewis Simons, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Scientific Instrument Maker</i>	
<i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	
Sanjiv Chadha	a Banker	St. John's Wood, London
<i>Peter Kenneth Estlin, Ald.</i>	<i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	
<i>Vincent Keaveny, Ald.</i>	<i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	
Her Excellency Janice Charette	The High Commissioner of Canada	Westminster, London
<i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i>		
<i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	
Kathleen Maria Agatiello	a Bank Branch Director	Newhall, Essex
<i>Keith David Forbes Bottomley, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	
<i>Timothy Levene, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Carmen</i>	
Jesal Patel	a Shop Manager	Ilford, Essex
<i>Sir Michael Snyder, Kt. Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Needlemaker</i>	
<i>Alexander Barr, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Ironmonger</i>	
Dame Susan Catherine Leather, DBE, DL	a Quango Chair	Exeter, Devon
<i>Thomas Dieter Dirk Hoffman, MBE</i>	<i>Citizen and Tyler & Bricklayer</i>	
<i>John Alfred Bennett, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	
Jodie Auckland Whittaker	an Actress	Muswell Hill, London
<i>Giles Robert Evelyn Shilson, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Ironmonger</i>	
<i>Thomas Sleigh, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	
Shirley Prudence Ann Henderson	a Publisher, retired	Beckenham, Kent
<i>John George Stewart Scott, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	
<i>John Alfred Bennett, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and International Banker</i>	
Eva Elizabeth Bolander	The Lord Provost of Glasgow	Partickhill, Glasgow
<i>Jeremy Lewis Simons, CC</i>	<i>Citizen and Scientific Instrument Maker</i>	
<i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness, Deputy</i>	<i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	
Hyung Dal Kim	a Pharmacist	Sutton, Surrey
<i>Michael Ernest Garrett, MBE</i>	<i>Citizen and Water Conservator</i>	
<i>Michael Raymond Mainelli, Ald.</i>	<i>Citizen and World Trader</i>	

Anne-Marie Ore-Ore Imafidon <i>Thomas Sleigh, CC</i> <i>Tijs Broeke, CC</i>	a Social Enterprise Company CEO <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	Stratford, Newham
Karen Holden <i>Thomas Sleigh, CC</i> <i>Tijs Broeke, CC</i>	a Solicitor <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	Chingford, Essex
Valerie Shawcross, CBE <i>Wendy Mead, OBE, CC</i> <i>Charles Edward Lord, OBE, JP, Deputy</i>	a Local Government Politician <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Broderer</i>	Upper Norwood, London
Connie Robins <i>Sir David Wootton, Kt., Ald.</i> <i>Philip Woodhouse, Deputy</i>	a Flower Company Director <i>Citizen and Fletcher</i> <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Barley, Hertfordshire
Professor Lynn Dobbs <i>Sophie Anne Fernandes, CC</i> <i>Karina Dostalova, CC</i>	a University Vice-Chancellor <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Marketor</i>	Putney, London
Aleya Begum <i>Henry Llewellyn Michael Jones, Deputy</i> <i>John William Fletcher, CC</i>	a Carer <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	Mansell Street, London
Claire Louise Harvey <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Charles Edward Lord, OBE, JP, CC</i>	a Leadership Consultant <i>Citizen and Broderer</i>	Smeeth, Ashford, Kent
Ruzena Holub <i>Sophie Anne Fernandes, CC</i> <i>Karina Dostalova, CC</i>	an Interpreter and Teacher <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Marketor</i>	Wembley, Middlesex
Greta Sandler <i>Clare Deborah James, CC</i> <i>Patricia Ann Holmes, CC</i>	a Social Work Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i> <i>Citizen and Common Councilman</i>	Sydenham Hill, London
Helen Evans <i>Peter Gordon Bennett, CC</i> <i>James Michael Douglas Thomson,</i> <i>Deputy</i>	an Advice Services Team Manager <i>Citizen and Chartered Surveyor</i> <i>Citizen and Grocer</i>	Scaynes Hill, West Sussex

Read.

A correction was made in respect page 34 of the circulated List, where the nominator for Helen Evans was incorrectly stated as David James Thompson, Citizen and Wax Chandler. Members were advised that this should be amended to James Michael Douglas Thomson, Deputy, Citizen and Grocer.

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. Legislation

The Court received a report on measures introduced by Parliament which might have an effect on the services provided by the City Corporation as follows:-

Statutory Instruments**Date in Force**

The Rent Officers (Housing Benefit and Universal Credit Functions) (Amendment) Order 2018 S.I. No.1332 25 January 2019

The Order makes technical changes to the calculation of the amount of local housing allowance payable to claimants. Changes include a 3% increase in the national maximum local housing allowance cap. The Order applies to the Common Council in its capacity as a local authority.

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

10.
Appointments

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

- (A) One Member on the **Establishment Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2021.

Nominations received:-

Christopher Michael Hayward

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Christopher Hayward to be appointed to the Establishment Committee.

- (B) Four Members on the **Barbican Residential Committee**, one for the balance of a term expiring in April 2022 and three for the balance of terms expiring in April 2019.

Nominations received:-

James Richard Tumbridge (for a term expiring in April 2019)

Mark Raymond Peter Henry Delano Wheatley (for the term expiring in April 2022)

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared James Tumbridge and Mark Wheatley to be appointed to the Barbican Residential Committee.

- (C) One Member on the **Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls**, for the balance of a term expiring in July 2021.

Nominations received:-

Dhruv Patel, O.B.E.

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Dhruv Patel to be appointed to the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls.

- (D) One Member on the **Standards Appeals Committee**, for the balance of a term expiring in April 2019.

Nominations received:-

Mark Bostock

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Mark Bostock to be appointed to the Standards Appeals Committee.

11. Questions

*Hailes, T.R.JP,
Alderman. to the
Chairman of the
Open Spaces
Committee*

Pet Cleaning Stations

Alderman Tim Hailes asked a question of the Chairman of the Open Spaces and City Gardens Committee concerning to the prospective provision of pet cleaning stations at the City of London Corporation's Open Spaces.

Responding, the Chairman advised that the Corporation's Open Spaces were already very dog friendly with a number of events and initiatives for dog owners. Following the recent introduction of the City of London Corporation (Open Spaces) Act 2018, the City Corporation could now licence commercial activity within its Open Spaces and pursue amenities such as those suggested by the Alderman. Consequently, he was pleased to agree that this suggestion, together with a number of other prospective amenities, could be considered by the Committee in the coming period.

*Pimlott, W. to the
Chair of the
Policy and
Resources
Committee*

Crescent House Renovation

William Pimlott asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee which sought a commitment for renovations to Crescent House to be carried out prior to certain works which were scheduled to be undertaken at Mansion House.

Responding, the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee emphasised that ensuring the quality of living arrangements for tenants was a priority for the City Corporation.

The Chair advised that she had taken a personal interest in this matter, having previously visited the Golden Lane Estate and highlighted concerns at the lack of progress with regard to the renovations. The Chair had subsequently undertaken a site inspection in October 2018 with the Town Clerk to monitor progress. She noted, however, that responsibility for the project's delivery resided with the Community and Children's Services Committee, rather than the Policy and Resources Committee; she was, therefore, not in a position to provide the Member with the commitment sought. However, she was certain that the Chairman of the Community and Children's Services Committee would be happy to discuss the programme of works in more detail with the Honourable Member. The Chair also

observed that the works to Mansion House, which was host to thousands of visitors and workers each year, were also necessary, adding that the two works were not related or contingent upon each other.

12. Motions
Boleat, M.

Motion – “Given –

- That the terms for Britain’s departure from the European Union negotiated by the British government seem unlikely to be approved by Parliament.
- That those terms are far removed from what was proposed by the official Leave campaign during the Referendum and ministerial statements after the Referendum.
- That the Prime Minister has indicated that if the exit terms that have been negotiated are not accepted the alternatives are exit without a deal and no Brexit.
- That opinion surveys show growing support for a referendum on whether to approve the deal or remain in the European Union.
- That while the financial services industry is well placed to handle Brexit it is doing so only by moving functions from London and the rest of the country, which will mean a significant loss of jobs and tax revenue in the longer term, and substantial damage to London’s position as an international business centre.
- That the Mayor of London, the London Assembly and a number of London boroughs have indicated support for a referendum.

This Court supports the holding of a referendum on the terms of Britain’s exit from the European Union with the electorate being given a choice that includes remaining in the European Union.”

Sir Mark spoke to introduce the Motion, explaining that, following Britain’s vote to leave the European Union in June 2016, there was still no clarity as to what Britain’s relationship would be with the European Union; this would have an adverse impact on London and the rest of the country, as a significant amount of business would move away from London. He proposed that a second referendum should be called on the matter, noting that the deal as set out by the Prime Minister bore no relation to what was presented in 2016 and there was now further information provided as to what the implications would be for Britain leaving the European Union. He argued that there was a strong case for the City Corporation to take a position given that the London Assembly and a number of other London Boroughs had already expressed a view, adding that the City Corporation’s responsibilities to its electorate and the people employed in the financial services and related industries gave further strength to this argument.

The Court proceeded to debate the Motion.

Deputy McGuinness spoke to oppose the Motion, noting that the City Corporation had a responsibility to speak for the jobs and prosperity in the square mile and sector and spoke for a critical part of the UK economy; however, she was unaware of any businesses or trade associations asking the City Corporation to call for a

second referendum. Deputy McGuinness noted that the City Corporation regularly spoke on matters of national interest and political importance and its views were informed by research, consultation with the sector, regulators, and other stakeholders. She expressed concern that the City Corporation's voice as a neutral party speaking on behalf of such stakeholders would be diminished if it were to support this Motion.

With reference to the actions of London Boroughs, Deputy McGuinness noted that they were politically driven, were following party lines, and their interventions would be viewed as such. She therefore asked Members to consider, regardless of their personal views, how best the voice of the City Corporation could be deployed and asked that they kept to a pragmatic approach.

During lengthy debate on the issue, a number of Members spoke in opposition to the Motion. The following arguments were made in support of this viewpoint:

- Some Members expressed the view that the City Corporation should not be engaging in party political matters and suggested that this was a matter that should be left to Parliament. The public had voted for Brexit and the solutions should be found in Westminster, not influenced by the Court of Common Council.
- Members noted that the financial services sector had not asked the City Corporation to consider supporting a second referendum, arguing that the City Corporation should therefore remain independent. To act like other party political authorities would weaken the City Corporation's position.
- Several Members expressed the view that, given that Brexit had been one of the most divisive issues for the country in living memory, to have a second referendum would add further division and would be undemocratic in any case as it did not respect the outcome of the first plebiscite.
- Members commented that, if a second referendum were to take place, this could not be held until at least 2020 and would contribute in creating dissent and disorder. They added that, at this point, both businesses and individuals sought certainty above all about the way forward, not continuing debate.
- Suggesting that this Motion could be viewed as a form of gesture politics, it was argued that Members should instead be lobbying and consulting politicians if they wished to seek the best outcome.
- A Member queried what benefit there would be for the Court to choose sides on this matter, positing that attempting to undermine the vote would result in a loss of credibility. It was noted that people had been told the results of the Brexit vote would be final and honoured; politicians were losing the respect of the public by continuing to prevaricate.
- Instead of the referendum choices proposed in Sir Mark's Motion, it was suggested that the democratic option would be for a referendum instead offer a choice between the Prime Minister's deal or Brexit on the World Trade Organisation's terms. This would mean the promise to the public would be kept and their choice respected.
- It was observed that, as the City Corporation already had a Brexit strategy, to pass this Motion would undermine that strategy and damage the credibility of the Chair of Policy and Resources. Members commented that the Motion would not assist the Chair in undertaking her role.

- Members added that, whilst there was undoubtedly misinformation given as part of the Brexit campaign in 2016, there had been misinformation on both sides; this was part of the democratic process which also occurred during general elections. Elections should not be re-run simply because people did not care for the outcome.

A number of Members took the opportunity to speak in favour of the City Corporation supporting a second referendum. The following arguments were advanced in support of this viewpoint:

- A Member spoke on behalf of those employees who were foreign nationals and who worked within the City's financial and professional services companies. They made an enormous contribution to the London economy and the City's global status, yet were denied a vote on an issue which directly affected them. A second referendum would help those individuals and this was an issue on which the City should take a stand on behalf of its constituents.
- Several Members, noting the public was now better informed and aware of the terms of the deal Britain would be signing up to, argued that the deal currently on the table represented a different proposition to what had originally been proposed and to push this through without consulting the public would be undemocratic.
- It was suggested that, whilst a new referendum would be divisive, the alternative would also be divisive, with it noted that there had already been demonstrations and more were likely if Parliament were to push this deal through. Britain's trading partners were observing the chaos and the only way to resolve this situation would be to give the people their democratic right to vote, with remaining in the EU as an option.
- Several Members spoke on behalf of the City residents and businesses they represented, commenting that residents had expressed the view to them that the public was now in a better position to make an informed choice. The message from businesses was equally clear, urging that all efforts be made to prevent a no deal Brexit.
- A Member, responding to the view that this was a matter for Parliament, countered that Parliament was deadlocked and Britain divided. Businesses and residents supported a second referendum and this path would resolve the impasse.
- A Member raised the issue of staff retention as a result of the Brexit vote and the damage this would cause to the London and UK economy, adding that some of the big businesses headquartered in London were triggering plans to relocate to other European locations.
- A Member, referring to the assertion that the financial and professional services sector had not asked the City Corporation to vote on this matter, suggested that the people who worked for those firms had in fact sought out Members to ask that they back a second referendum. Members of the Court were far more connected to the workers in the Square Mile than in the past and it was their interests that the Court should represent and support. This was an issue which had and would continue to affect the people and firms within the City more than any other and the Court should take a view on this.

*Littlechild,
V., M.B.E., J.P.*

Motion – That, in accordance with Standing Order No. 2(2), Standing Order No. 12(6) be suspended to allow for continued debate on this Motion.

The Lord Mayor declared the Motion to be carried.

Once again, a number of Members spoke in opposition to the Motion that the City Corporation support a second referendum, and the following arguments were made in support of this viewpoint:

- Some Members continued to argue this was not a matter for the Court to decide. If a second referendum did not take place until 2020, this would lead to greater uncertainty and would be damaging. The matter should be resolved and not prolonged.
- This Motion could only be seen as a pro-remain move and the City Corporation should not take a position on this, it would blunt the organisation's credibility, its relationships with businesses and its ability to represent the City. A second referendum could not undo the events of the past two years and from what has transpired, the UK could not remain with the EU.
- A Member noted that the opening remarks regarding this Motion had referenced the March Court meeting of 2016. The Member reminded the Court, that this debate had taken place in two parts; with the first debate being a 60/40 decision as to whether the Court should adopt an opinion and the final strength of this decision could be debated. The Member commented that at that meeting the mover of this Motion had been the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee and they had the Committee's support. However, the current Chair did not support the Motion and Members should think of her position. The Member advised caution and suggested the Motion be withdrawn.

Members also took the opportunity to speak in support of the City Corporation supporting the referendum, and following points were expressed:

- A Member commented that Brexit was a fundamental part of trade and it was therefore appropriate for the City to take a view as to what would provide businesses with the greatest level of certainty. The public was better informed about the European Union than in 2016 and it would therefore be appropriate to once again take the view of the country.
- A Member expressed the view that the country was on the cusp of final decisions Members should on behalf of residents and city workers, support a second referendum as that would be the only chance to remain with the European Union. The Member explained that this was not a matter of normal negotiation where Members would always back the Chair of Policy and Resources.

*Lord, C.E.,
O.B.E., J.P., Deputy;
Thomson,
J.M.D. Deputy.*

Motion – That, in accordance with Standing Order 11(9), the Question be now put.

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

The Town Clerk invited Sir Mark to close the debate.

Sir Mark addressed the points raised and noted that, whilst some had argued this was not a matter for the City Corporation to debate, a large number of Members had spoken which demonstrated the strength of feeling on this matter. Sir Mark clarified that the Motion was simply for a referendum which included as one of its options remaining in the European Union and did not seek to exclude any other option. Responding to the views expressed, Sir Mark commented that this was not party political, the Labour and Conservative parties were both opposed to a referendum and this was a matter outside of the normal electoral process where the winners had simply walked away.

Sir Mark concluded noting that another referendum would be divisive but Brexit itself had been too and the public should be given a chance to vote on a deal which would affect their future.

Upon the Motion being put, the Lord Mayor declared it to be lost. A division being demanded and granted, there appeared:-

For the Affirmative 33

ALDERMEN

Garbutt, J.
Gifford, Sir Roger

Graves, D. A.
Jones, G. P., Q.C.,

COMMONERS

Ali, M.
Anderson, R.K.
Anderson, T.A.
Bastow, A.M.
Bensted-Smith, N.M., J.P.
Boleat, Sir Mark
Bostock, M.
Broeke, T.

Everett, K.M.
Fairweather, A.H.
Fredericks, M.B.
Hill, C.
Holmes, A.
Knowles-Cutler, A.
Levene, T.
Littlechild, V., J.P.

Lloyd Owen, N.
Pimlott, W.
Pritchard, J.P.
de Sausmarez, H.J.
Sayed, R.
Scott, J.G.S., J.P.,

Bennett, J.A., Deputy
Cassidy, M.J., C.B.E., Deputy

Lord, C.E., O.B.E., J.P., Deputy
Sleigh, T., Deputy

Tomlinson, J., B.A., Deputy

Tellers for the affirmative – (Affirmative) Wendy Hyde and William Upton (Negative).

For the Negative 60

ALDERMEN

Edhem, E.
Gowman, A.J.
Goyal, P.B., O.B.E., J.P.
Hailes, T.R., Sheriff
Howard, R.P.S.

Hughes-Penney, R.
Keaveny, V.T.
King, A.J.N., M.Sc.
Luder, I.D.
Mainelli, M.R.

Parmley, Sir Alan
Russell, W.A.B.
Wootton, Sir David
Yarrow, Sir Alan

COMMONERS

Barr, A.R.M.
Barrow, D.
Bennett, P.G.
Chapman, J.D.
Duckworth, S.D'O., O.B.E., D.L.
Dunphy, P.G.
Durcan, J.M.
Fernandes, S.A.
Haines, C.W.
Harrower, G.G.

Hayward, C.M.
Hudson, M.
Joshi, S.J.
Mayer, A.P.
Mayhew, J.P.,
McMurtrie, A.S., J.P.
Mead, Mrs. W., O.B.E.
Moys, Mrs. S.D.
Murphy, B.D.

Newman, B.P., C.B.E.
Pearson, S.J.
Petrie, J.
Seaton, I.C.N.
Sells, O., Q.C.
Simons, J.L.
Smith, G.M.
Tumbridge, J.R.
Wheatley, M.R.

Bottomley, K.D.F., Deputy
Bradshaw, D.J., Deputy
Chadwick, R.A.H., O.B.E., Deputy
Hoffman, T., Deputy
Ingham Clark, J., Deputy
James, C. M.A., Deputy

Jones, H.L.M., Deputy
McGuinness, C., Deputy
Merrett, R.A., Deputy
Mooney, B.D.F., Deputy
Morris, H. F., Deputy

Nash, Mrs. J.C., O.B.E., Deputy
Pollard, J.H.G., Deputy
Rogula, E., Deputy
Thomson, J.M.D., Deputy
Woodhouse, P., Deputy

Tellers for the negative – John Fletcher (Negative) and Henry Colthurst (Affirmative).

Upon the result of the division being announced, the Lord Mayor declared the Motion to be lost.

Munsur, M.

Motion – “That this Honourable Court expresses its regret as the minority Rohingya population suffering persecution still await justice, especially as the international world continues to call for justice and most recently the call to bring the generals of the Myanmar army to justice for genocide.

This Court therefore resolves that:

1. The Freedom Applications Committee commences, forthwith, the process to revoke the Honorary Freedom granted to Aung San Suu Kyi in May of 2017.
2. The Freedom Applications Committee provides an update to the Court at the March meeting.”

Mr Ali introduced the Motion, thanking the Chairman of the Freedoms Applications Committee for his assistance in this matter and advising the Court that the Motion before Members was to action a process to revoke the Honorary Freedom awarded to Aung San Suu Kyi. He argued that Aung San Suu Kyi had failed to protect the Rohingya or speak out for them and had denied the genocide which took place. As the head of the country, she had failed to protect her own people and, therefore, no longer merited the Honorary Freedom.

Alderman Sir David Wootton spoke to help clarify the process which would commence, should the Court support the Motion. He reminded Members of the protocol which the Court had approved in September 2018 , explaining that this Motion would start the process towards revocation; the Freedoms Application Committee would move to inform the Honorary Freeman of the proposal to remove the Freedom, together with the reasons for the proposal, and invite their comments on it. The remainder of the defined process would then ensue.

Alderman Sir David Wootton proceeded to set out the reasons both for and against revocation as he saw them and advised that he would not express a view on either side of the arguments. He asked if Members could, during discussion, cite the reasons behind their views, which would be communicated to the Honorary Freeman if a decision was made for revocation.

Discussion amongst Members ensued, with several Members speaking to express their sympathy and condemning the horrific violence inflicted by the military.

During discussion, a number of Members spoke in opposition to the Motion, with the following arguments advanced in support of this viewpoint:

- It was suggested that any decision should be taken with reference to the totality of the individual’s contributions, observing that consideration should be given to the twenty-five years of hard work and the courage the Honorary Freeman had displayed during that time, rather than simply making a decision in the context of the last twenty-five months.
- It was argued that the City Corporation should not engage in gesture politics and concerns were raised that, if the Motion were to be approved, the focus would be on Aung San Suu Kyi instead of those who had ordered the acts to

take place; the City Corporation and others should instead be seeking to bring those individuals to account.

- It was argued that the award had been made with the tacit approval of the Foreign & Commonwealth Office and that the Government had not expressed a wish to revoke the Freedom.
- A Member cautioned that the City Corporation should not be revisiting previous awards to try and rewrite history but should stand by the judgement made at the time of the award.
- It was cautioned that the constraints under which Aung San Suu Kyi might be operating at present were not known; it would therefore be unwise to act precipitately and rescind the Freedom under such circumstances.
- A Member commented that the Freedom had been offered to Aung San Suu Kyi years before she was able to receive it and there was much unknown about the situation in Burma which may reveal itself over time. It was added that there were different arguments being presented via the media around the world and these were matters beyond the scope of the Court.

Several Members also spoke to support the proposed Motion with the following viewpoints articulated:

- Rebutting the suggestion that the revocation would be seeking to rewrite history, a Member observed the atrocities were not historic and were, in fact, taking place now. He referenced a recent United Nations fact-finding mission, noting that it had been determined that Aung San Suu Kyi and her government had contributed to the atrocities, with the Honorary Freeman having not used her political position to condemn the acts.
- A Member spoke to dispute the argument that this was gesture politics, noting that to dismiss it as such would be to dismiss the Honorary Freedom itself. It was added that this was an issue of conscience and the question of whether the Honorary Freedom should have been awarded was of importance. Recognised international bodies had named Aung San Suu Kyi as being partially responsible for the atrocities, the Freedom had been given in some Members' opinions in error and should be revoked.
- A Member commented that the City Corporation should stand against genocide and this went to the heart of the relevance of the City Corporation.
- A Member observed that the Court had already determined to delay in making a decision once, only to see further atrocities take place. The City Corporation had a moral duty to take responsibility for its actions and should cease to prevaricate on this matter.

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

Motion – That, in accordance with Standing Order 11(9), the Question be now put.

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

The Town Clerk invited Mr Ali to close the debate.

Mr Ali thanked the Chairman of the Freedoms Application and Members for the discussion.

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

Resolved – That this Honourable Court expresses its regret as the minority Rohingya population suffering persecution still await justice, especially as the international world continues to call for justice and most recently the call to bring the generals of the Myanmar army to justice for genocide.

This Court therefore further resolves that:

1. The Freedom Applications Committee shall commence forthwith the process to revoke the Honorary Freedom granted to Aung San Suu Kyi in May of 2017.
2. The Freedom Applications Committee shall provide an update to the Court at the March 2019 meeting.

13. Awards &
Prizes

There were none.

14.

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE AND ESTABLISHMENT COMMITTEE

(Catherine McGuinness, Deputy)

(Charles Edward Lord, OBE, JP, Deputy)

3 December 2018

Review of the City of London Police Authority – Resourcing & Governance Arrangements

The Court considered a joint report of the Policy and Resources Committee and Establishment Committee which **recommended** a base budget uplift to the Police Authority of up to £250,000 within City Fund; and the approval of the creation of a Grade I post within the Chamberlain's Department. This funding and post would strengthen the capacity and capability of the Police Authority function.

Responding to a question from Mr McMurtrie regarding the annual cost of running the City of London Police force and the proportion of overall expenditure spent on the Police service, the Chair of Policy and Resources provided the Honourable Member with the gross costs and net costs for 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 against the originally budgeted figures but explained that the figures varied from year to year. The Chair explained that in future years, the Police Authority was forecasting deficits and work was underway to identify how best to close that gap. The Chair provided further figures to the Honourable Member explaining that Police expenditure was 28.7% of City Fund expenditure and 17.6% of all City Corporation expenditure.

Mr McMurtrie, thanking the Chair for her comments, asked a further question as to the reasons behind why the forecast expenditure was significantly more than budgeted. The Chair of the Establishment Committee in response explained that it was important to ensure the Police Authority had the relevant resources in place and resources would be added to the Town Clerk's Department and Chamberlain's Department to assist the Police Authority.

Resolved – That the Court:

- endorse a base budget uplift to the Police Authority within City Fund of up to £250,000 with effect from 2019/20 to be considered as part of the annual budget setting and medium-term financial planning process; and
- approve the creation of a Grade I post in the Chamberlain's Department.

15. **FINANCE COMMITTEE**

(Jeremy Paul Mayhew)

16 November 2018

Report of Urgent Taken: Waste Collection, Street Cleansing and Ancillary Services – Contract Award Report

The Court received a report advising of action taken under urgency procedures regarding the award of a contract for the provision of waste collection, street cleansing, and ancillary services.

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

16.
Scott, J.G.S.,
J.P.; Mayhew,
J.P.

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

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

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

18. **Policy and Resources Committee**

The Court considered a report which provided an update and sought approval with regards to funding for the Centre for Music.

19. **Policy and Resources Committee and Finance Committee**

The Court received a report of urgent action taken with regards to the Markets Consolidation Programme.

19b. **Finance Committee**

The Court considered a late report of the Finance Committee with regards to an amendment to the Treasury Management Strategy.

20. **Establishment Committee**

The Court considered a report of the Establishment Committee with regards to the creation of a post.

21. **Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls**

The Court considered a report of the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls which sought approval to progress a project.

22. **Property Investment Board**

The Court considered a report of the Property Investment Board which sought approval of a new ground lease.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and ended at 3.40 pm

BARRADELL.