



ESTLIN, MAYOR

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

18th July 2019
MEMBERS PRESENT

ALDERMEN

Sir Charles Edward Beck Bowman
Emma Edhem
The Rt. Hon. the Lord Mayor, Alderman Peter Estlin
John Garbutt
Sir Roger Gifford
Alison Gowman

Prem Goyal
David Andrew Graves
Timothy Russell Hailes
Sheriff Vincent Thomas Keaveny
Alastair John Naisbitt King
Susan Langley

Ian David Luder
Nicholas Stephen Leland Lyons
Professor Michael Raymond Mainelli
Sir Andrew Charles Parmley
William Anthony Bowater Russell
Sir David Hugh Wootton

COMMONERS

George Christopher Abrahams
Caroline Kordai Addy
Munsur Ali
Rehana Banu Ameer
Randall Keith Anderson
Alexander Robertson Martin Barr
Douglas Barrow
Adrian Mark Bastow
Deputy John Bennett
Peter Gordon Bennett
Nicholas Michael Bensted-Smith
Mark Bostock
Deputy Keith David Forbes
Bottomley
Deputy David John Bradshaw
Tijs Broeke
Deputy Michael John Cassidy
Deputy Roger Arthur Holden Chadwick
John Douglas Chapman
Graeme Doshi-Smith

Karina Dostalova
Simon D'Olier Duckworth
Peter Gerard Dunphy
Mary Durcan
Deputy Kevin Malcolm Everett
Anne Helen Fairweather
Sophie Anne Fernandes
Marianne Bernadette Fredericks
Tracey Graham
Deputy The Revd Stephen Decatur Haines
Graeme Harrower
Christopher Michael Hayward
Deputy Tom Hoffman
Ann Holmes
Michael Hudson
Deputy Wendy Hyde
Deputy Jamie Ingham Clark
Deputy Henry Llewellyn Michael Jones
Shravan Jashvantrai Joshi

Angus Knowles-Cutler
Vivienne Littlechild
Oliver Arthur Wynlayne Lodge
Deputy Edward Lord
Paul Nicholas Martinelli
Andrew Paul Mayer
Jeremy Mayhew
Deputy Catherine McGuinness
Andrew Stratton McMurtrie
Wendy Mead
Deputy Robert Allan Merrett
Andrien Gereith Dominic Meyers
Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney
Deputy Alastair Michael Moss
Sylvia Doreen Moys
Deputy Joyce Carruthers Nash
Graham Packham
Dhruv Patel
Susan Jane Pearson

John Petrie
Judith Pleasance
Deputy James Henry George Pollard
Henrika Johanna Sofia Priest
Jason Paul Pritchard
Stephen Douglas Quilter
Deputy Elizabeth Rogula
James de Sausmarez
Ruby Sayed
John George Stewart Scott
Deputy Dr Giles Robert Evelyn Shilson
Jeremy Lewis Simons
Deputy Tom Sleigh
Sir Michael Snyder
Deputy James Michael Douglas Thomson
Deputy John Tomlinson
James Richard Tumbridge
William Upton QC
Mark Raymond Peter Henry Delano Wheatley

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 Minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.
4. Resolutions There were none.

5. Mayoral Visits The Right Honourable The Lord Mayor reported on his recent visits to the United States of America, Canada, Malaysia, Indonesia, and China.
6. Policy Statement The Policy Chair spoke to provide Members with an update on the Fundamental Review, the latest position in respect of the City Corporation's borrowing arrangements, and the outcomes of the London Bridge Inquests.
- The Chairman of the Police Authority Board spoke to join the Policy Chair in commending all those who had responded on that tragic night, as well as to send thoughts and condolences to the families and friends of those who had lost loved ones in the attacks. He added that the Inquests had been meticulous in their scrutiny of the events and that there was much to consider; the City Police and City Corporation would seek to learn everything possible from the findings and carefully review procedures and processes. He hoped to be in a position to update the Court in the autumn with details of any actions that were required to further support the commitment to the security of the City.
7. Hospital Seal There were no docquets to be sealed.
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:-

Kiana Parsno <i>John Alexander Smail</i> <i>Stephen James Osborne</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Distiller</i> <i>Citizen and Chartered Secretaries & Administrator</i>	Finchley, London
Harold Michael Scott <i>David Howard Higgs</i> <i>Jane Morag Loader</i>	an Engineer, retired <i>Citizen and Tax Adviser</i> <i>Citizen and Tax Adviser</i>	Longstanton, Cambridgeshire
Hilary Ann Andrews <i>George Richard Albert Andrews</i> <i>Nicholas Charles George Andrews</i>	a Registered Nurse <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Pattenmaker</i>	Tonbridge, Kent
Darren Paul Hardy <i>Michael Steele Keith Grant</i> <i>Sir Andrew Charles Parmley, Ald.</i>	a Musician <i>Citizen and Information Technologist</i> <i>Citizen and Musician</i>	Romford, Essex
Janette Elizabeth Burt <i>Alan Leslie Warman</i> <i>Diane Irene Warman</i>	a Human Resources Manager, retired <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Clockmaker</i>	Welwyn, Hertfordshire
Farjad Ahmed <i>Wendy Mead, OBE, CC</i> <i>Patricia Agnes Campfield, MBE</i>	a Distribution Company Director <i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i>	Hendon, London
Corey Joseph Cook <i>Michael Raymond Mainelli, Ald.</i> <i>Peter Mansi</i>	a Chartered Financial Analyst <i>Citizen and World Trader</i> <i>Citizen and Firefighter</i>	Whetstone, London
Ruth Shane	a Psychoanalytic Psychotherapist	Stoke Newington,

<i>John McKay Ludgate, RD, DL</i> <i>Callum Bairstow Ludgate</i>	<i>Citizen and Glover</i> <i>Citizen and Shipwright</i>	London
Chad Lloyd Coombes <i>Antonio Masella</i> <i>Michael Osborne</i>	a Surveyor Company Director <i>Citizen and Mason</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	Fetcham, Surrey
Amy Charlotte McManus <i>Shravan Joshi</i> <i>James De Sausmarez</i>	a Marketing Agency Director <i>Citizen and Fueller</i> <i>Citizen and Joiner and Ceiler</i>	Ash, Kent
Karen Newbury <i>Harry Andrew Crook</i> <i>Paul Quellyn-Roberts</i>	an Accountant <i>Citizen and Apothecaries</i> <i>Citizen and Distiller</i>	Chester, Cheshire
Paul John Weeks <i>Donald Howard Coombe, MBE</i> <i>Michael Richard Butler</i>	a Headmaster, retired <i>Citizen and Poulter</i> <i>Citizen and Poulter</i>	Norwich, Norfolk
Susan Elizabeth Badman <i>Keith David Forbes Bottomley, Deputy</i> <i>William Barrie Fraser, OBE</i>	a Management Consultant, retired <i>Citizen and Wheelwright</i> <i>Citizen and Gardener</i>	Herne Hill, London
Calum John Paton <i>John Alexander Smail</i> <i>Dorothy Newlands of Lauriston</i>	a Student <i>Citizen and Distiller</i> <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i>	New Malden, Surrey
Philip Charles Robinson <i>Colin James Bridgen</i> <i>Jeffrey Charles Williams</i>	an Engineer/auditor <i>Citizen and Carmen</i> <i>Citizen and Carmen</i>	Little Stoke, Bristol
Dr Kevin Mark Christopher Stone <i>Colin James Bridgen</i> <i>Jeffrey Charles Williams</i>	an Academic <i>Citizen and Carmen</i> <i>Citizen and Carmen</i>	Bristol
Mark Richard Elton <i>Colin James Bridgen</i> <i>Jeffrey Charles Williams</i>	an Information Technology Director <i>Citizen and Carmen</i> <i>Citizen and Carmen</i>	Gloucester
Sophie Elizabeth Robertson <i>David Frank Batchelor</i> <i>Dr Lesley Patricia Muriel Taor</i>	a Teacher <i>Citizen and Turner</i> <i>Citizen and Art Scholars</i>	Plaistow, London
Alexander Durie Robertson <i>David Frank Batchelor</i> <i>Dr Lesley Patricia Muriel Taor</i>	an Investment Banker <i>Citizen and Turner</i> <i>Citizen and Art Scholars</i>	Battersea, London
Diana Caroline Robertson <i>David Frank Batchelor</i> <i>Dr Lesley Patricia Muriel Taor</i>	a Teacher <i>Citizen and Turner</i> <i>Citizen and Art Scholars</i>	Wanstead, London
James David Gwyn Morris <i>Maximilian Hugh Carter</i> <i>Henry Butler Lloyd</i>	a Stockbroker, retired <i>Citizen and Merchant Taylor</i> <i>Citizen and Mercer</i>	Hawkhurst, Kent
Christopher John Casselden <i>Simon Phillip Bannister</i> <i>Anthony Leonard Wright</i>	a Mechanical Engineer, retired <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i> <i>Citizen and Blacksmith</i>	Sutton, Surrey
Elizabeth Jane Hillman	a Civil Servant	Ashford, Middlesex

<i>David James Sales</i> <i>Graham John Fielding</i>	<i>Citizen and Insurer</i> <i>Citizen and Gunmaker</i>	
Matthew James Barclay <i>William James Barclay</i> <i>Mark Anthony Grove</i>	an Engineer <i>Citizen and Master Mariner</i> <i>Citizen and Cook</i>	Chingford, London
Hannah Elizabeth Barclay <i>William James Barclay</i> <i>Mark Anthony Grove</i>	a Project Manager <i>Citizen and Master Mariner</i> <i>Citizen and Cook</i>	South Woodford, London
Iain William Edward Clack <i>Elaine Irene Clack</i> <i>William George Thomas</i>	a Customer Services Director <i>Citizen and Fanmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Fanmaker</i>	Cippenham, Berkshire
Taylor McKillop <i>Michael Ernest Garrett, MBE</i> <i>Steven Edward Harsum</i>	an Investment Analyst <i>Citizen and Water Conservator</i> <i>Citizen and Spectacle Maker</i>	Port Seton, East Lothian, Scotland
Dr Onkar Singh Sahota <i>Prem Babu Goyal, OBE, JP, Ald.</i> <i>Dhruv Patel, OBE, CC</i>	a Doctor <i>Citizen and Plumber</i> <i>Citizen and Clothworker</i>	Norwood Green, Middlesex
Chikezie Ekeanyanwu <i>Anne Elizabeth Holden</i> <i>Ann-Marie Jefferys</i>	an Information Technology Consultant <i>Citizen and Basketmaker</i> <i>Citizen and Glover</i>	Barnet, London
Xinyue Zhang <i>Neil Frederick Purcell</i> <i>Michele McCarthy</i>	a Digital Marketing Manager <i>Citizen and Painter Stainer</i> <i>Citizen and Scrivener</i>	Mississauga, Ontario, Canada
Adnan Anwar Malik <i>Alan Montague Ware, MBE</i> <i>Thurailingham Pavanakumar</i>	a Transport Company Director <i>Citizen and Gold & Silver Wyre Drawer</i> <i>Citizen and Spectacle Maker</i>	Dagenham, Essex
The Rt. Hon. Philip Anthony Hammond, MP <i>The Rt. Hon The Lord Mayor</i> <i>Catherine Sidony McGuinness,</i> <i>Deputy</i>	a Member of Parliament <i>Citizen and Solicitor</i>	Westminster, London

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. Legislation

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

Bills

The Animal Welfare (Sentencing) Bill

The Bill seeks to increase the maximum sentence for specified animal welfare offences, including causing unnecessary suffering to an animal, from six months to five years. The Bill is of interest to the Common Council owing to its responsibility for the enforcement of animal welfare legislation across London.

Statutory Instruments

The Social Fund (Children's Funeral Fund for England) Regulations 2019 S.I. No. 1064

Date in force
7th May 2019

The Regulations establish the Children's Funeral Fund for England, which will pay the fees charged by burial and cremation authorities for funerals and associated expenses related to the funerals of children below the age of 18 and still-born children born after 24 weeks' gestation. The Regulations apply to the Common Council in its capacity as a burial and cremation authority.

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

Read.

10. Ballot
Results

The Town Clerk reported the result of the ballot taken at the last Court, as follows:-

One Member to the **Finance Committee**.

	Votes
Andrien Gereith Dominic Meyers	63
James Richard Tumbridge	27

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Andrien Meyers to be appointed to the Finance Committee.

11.
Appointments

The Court proceeded to consider appointments to the following Committees and Outside Bodies:-

Where appropriate:-

** denotes a Member standing for re-appointment.*

(A) Two Members on the **Board of Governors of the City of London School**, for terms expiring in July 2023.

Nominations received:-

*Marianne Bernadette Fredericks

*Sylvia Doreen Moys

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Marianne Fredericks and Sylvia Moys to be appointed to the Board of Governors of the City of London School.

- (B) Five Members on the **Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls**; three vacancies for terms expiring in July 2023; one vacancy for the balance of a term expiring in July 2022; and one vacancy for the balance of a term expiring in July 2021.

Nominations received:-

- *Randall Keith Anderson
- *Tom Hoffman, M.B.E., Deputy
- *Sylvia Doreen Moys

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Randall Anderson, Deputy Tom Hoffman, and Sylvia Moys to be appointed to the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls.

- (C) Five Members on the **Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School**; two vacancies for terms expiring in July 2023; one vacancy for the balance of a term expiring in July 2022; one vacancy for the balance of a term expiring in July 2021, and one vacancy for the balance of a term expiring in July 2020.

Nominations received:-

- *John Alfred Bennett, M.B.E., Deputy
- *Michael Hudson

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Deputy John Bennett and Michael Hudson to be appointed to the Board of Governors of the City of London Freeman's School.

- (D) One Member on the **Licensing Committee**, for a term expiring in April 2023.

Nominations received:-

John William Fletcher

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared John Fletcher to be appointed to the Licensing Committee.

- (E) One Member on the **City University of London**, for a term expiring in July 2023.

Nominations received:-

- *Jeremy Paul Mayhew

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Jeremy Mayhew to be appointed to the City University of London.

- (F) One Member on the **City & Guilds of London Institute** for a four-year term expiring in August 2023.

Nominations received:-

*Wendy Mead, O.B.E.

Read.

Whereupon the Lord Mayor declared Wendy Mead to be appointed to the City & Guilds of London Institute.

12. Questions

*Bostock, M., to the
Chair of Policy &
Resources*

Future of the City of London School for Girls

Mark Bostock asked a question of the Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee concerning the future of the City of London School for Girls within the Barbican Estate and the potential for its relocation.

Responding, the Chair made reference to the current proposed expansion of the City of London School for Girls, in which there was significant interest. She observed that the Barbican Estate was a hugely significant architectural prize for the City, of which it was extremely proud, and expressed her certainty that the Planning & Transportation Committee would discharge its responsibilities diligently when it came to consider current proposals or any future planning applications which might affect the Estate.

The Chair reminded the Court of the organisation's longstanding approach in respect of the management of individual service areas being entrusted to the responsible committees and Boards. Given this, it would be a matter for the Board of Governors of the Girls' School to determine how it might best deliver its services in the first instance. She reminded Members that the Barbican had been built as a multi-use estate, including a school, arts centre, and other facilities.

Responding to a supplementary question from Mark Bostock, in which he sought a commitment for the City Corporation to champion the Barbican as an iconic estate and actively consider the relocation of all or part of the Girls' School, the Chair suggested that the City Corporation would certainly wish to champion the Barbican Estate but that the future of the School was, ultimately, a matter for the Board of Governors of the City of London School for Girls to consider in the first instance.

Right of Light Payments

*Luder, I.D., Alderman,
to the Chairman of
Standards*

Alderman Ian Luder asked a question of the Chairman of the Standards Committee *as to* whether she would confirm rumours that a Member had made a claim for rights of light arising from the construction of the City of London Primary Academy Islington, whether such a claim had been settled, and whether she would agree that this indicated a disclosable pecuniary interest was engaged.

Replying, the Chairman of the Standards Committee confirmed her understanding

that a number of properties were so affected by the City of London Primary Academy Islington development that they had been offered financial compensation for loss of rights to light, and that one of these properties appeared in the Register of Interests of an elected member. The compensation figures had not yet been agreed and legal agreements had not yet been entered into in respect of those properties.

The Chairman recognised that the rules on disclosable pecuniary interests could be difficult to apply, as acknowledged by the latest report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, who had called for legislative change. However, on the basis of the current law, it was her view that a Member whose property was so affected by a planning application that it entitled them to rights of light compensation should the development proceed had an engaged disclosable pecuniary interest in that application.

Susan Pearson spoke to ask a supplementary question, enquiring whether the Chairman would make democratic representation and transparency the guiding principles of the reform of the standards regime. She also identified herself as the Member to whom the original question referred and thanked those Members who had forewarned her about the question, whilst expressing disappointment that the questioner had not sought to clarify the position with her ahead of the meeting. She clarified that she had not been the recipient of any compensation and that, should there be any, it would be in a private capacity and entirely separate from her role as a Common Councillor. She added that the relevant Right of Light issue had arisen in only one meeting she had attended, at which she declared an interest and did not participate in discussion. Responding, the Chairman clarified that the power to make changes to the regime rested with Members of this Court and that full consideration would be given to material issues during the review of the current policies.

Noxious Odours

*Lodge, O.A.W., to the
Chairman of Port
Health &
Environmental
Services*

Oliver Lodge asked a question of the Chairman of the Port Health & Environmental Services Committee concerning enforcement powers in relation to unpleasant odours being extracted from restaurant and café premises and pumped out on to street level.

Replying, the Chairman detailed the statutory context for controlling such emissions and explained the City's approach from both a Planning and Environmental Health perspective in dealing with this matter. He clarified that, from an Environmental Health perspective, statutory nuisance powers were only applicable to odours experienced within premises and could not be used for odours experienced by passers-by and that the threshold for statutory nuisance was relatively high. Consequently, the control of noise and odour from commercial kitchens was achieved most effectively through the planning process, through attempting to prevent problems before they occurred, rather than responding reactively through the statutory nuisance process. The Chairman also outlined a number of recent incidents where positive outcomes had been achieved through working in co-operation with businesses.

In response to a supplementary question from Oliver Lodge, the Chairman

confirmed that Environmental Health officers would continue to work with Planning colleagues closely in an effort to “design out” potential issues during the planning application process. He also undertook to speak with officers to see whether there might be scope to seek additional powers to be awarded in respect of enforcement.

Cart Marking

*Sleigh, T. Deputy, to
the Chairman of
Culture, Heritage &
Libraries*

Deputy Tom Sleigh asked a question of the Chairman of the Culture, Heritage & Libraries Committee concerning the cost and impact of the annual Cart Marking ceremony.

In reply, the Chairman advised that the charges associated with the Highway related costs were set by the Department of the Built Environment, through their agreed schedule of charges for activities on the public highway. These amounted to an anticipated £8,900 for cart marking for the coming year.

Responding to a supplementary question from Deputy Sleigh, the Chairman advised that exploratory discussions had begun in respect of potentially moving the event to a weekend. He added that he was not aware of the position in respect of police costs but would be happy to speak with the Chair of the Police Authority Board.

In reply to a further supplementary question from Alderman Ian Luder, the Chairman agreed that the principles employed in respect of charging and minimising the impact of such events should be applied consistently.

Dockless Bike Hire

*Sleigh, T., Deputy, to
the Chairman of
Planning &
Transportation*

Deputy Tom Sleigh asked a question of the Chairman of the Planning & Transportation Committee concerning the dockless bike hire scheme.

Responding, the Chairman advised that a six-month trial of a new approach to managing dockless cycle hire had been implemented. This sought to assess the effectiveness of designating parking locations for dockless cycles, as a means of addressing the problem of inappropriately parked bikes obstructing pavements. The Chairman also outlined the details of the selection exercise that had been undertaken to choose operators to participate and the scoring process used to determine the successful applicants.

In response to a supplementary question from Deputy Sleigh in relation to the selection process and the criteria used, the Chairman suggested that officers should be commended for their work to date on the trial and declined to commit to re-opening the process. He advised that the next steps and final approach would depend on the powers that became available to the City Corporation under a pan-London operating and regulatory framework for dockless cycle hire, supported by a new byelaw. This was currently being prepared by London Councils and Transport for London. If it were possible under the byelaw for the City to apply minimum operating or quality criteria to operators and to limit the number of total operators, then an open process would be run to choose suitable operators. There was a wide range of criteria which could be used and the results of the ongoing trial would help inform that process.

In response to a further supplementary question from Vivienne Littlechild, the Chairman clarified that there was a zero-tolerance policy in respect of abandoned bicycles and that a robust line was being taken with operators.

13. Motions There were no motions.

14. Awards & Prizes There was no report.

15. **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)

4 July 2019

Scheme of Delegations

The Scheme of Delegations to officers had not been reviewed in its entirety since 2014 and now needed updating to take account of revisions made to officer and departmental structures, updates to legislation, and a number of proposed new delegations to assist in the day-to-day management of the organisation.

As the Committee responsible for the review and co-ordination of the governance of the City of London Corporation, including its committees, standing orders and outside bodies scheme, the Policy and Resources Committee had reviewed the document and now **recommended** the amended document be approved.

An addendum, correcting a small number of additional typographical errors, had also been circulated.

Resolved – That the proposed changes to the Scheme of Delegations to Officers, as set out in the appendix to the report and the accompanying addendum, be approved.

16. **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

FINANCE COMMITTEE

(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)

(Jeremy Paul Mayhew)

21 May 2019

(A) Expansion of the City of London Girl's School

In April 2019, the Policy & Resources Committee and Resource Allocation Sub-Committee had agreed that a loan should be approved for the proposed expansion of the City of London School for Girls, in the event that it proceeded.

Following that decision, the Finance Committee was required to approve a revision to the Corporation's budget of up to £15.3m to facilitate the loan. In-year budget adjustments of this nature were required to be considered by the Finance Committee prior to consideration by the Court of Common Council. The Court was **recommended** to approve the requisite budget adjustment, noting that scheme would be subject to full planning approval and draw down of the loan would happen only in the event that the project was approved at the various relevant stages.

The Chair of Policy and Resources spoke to introduce the debate, clarifying that the provision of a loan was standard practice for the City Corporation in respect of major capital funding requirements for the independent Schools, as they were prohibited from seeking loans directly, as other Schools would do, and so had to seek them via the City Corporation. The same mechanism was being employed in respect of the ongoing project at the City of London Freeman's School, as Members would note at Item 16(B).

The Chairman of Finance also spoke to introduce the item, clarifying that, whilst he was opposed to the School's current expansion proposal, the loan proposal that the Court was being asked to consider here was not scheme specific, as demonstrated by the explicit provision for abortive costs within the overall sum. The appropriate committees would take a view on the merits of particular schemes in the normal fashion; the role of the Finance Committee and the Court at this stage was to consider the in-year budget adjustment. He expressed his hope that this provided some reassurance to concerned parties, as he was conscious that there was a misconception that the approval to be made would constitute explicit support for the currently mooted expansion proposal.

During debate, a number of Members spoke to oppose the proposal, with it suggested that undertakings had been made on the occasion of previous expansions that there would be no further enlargement in the future. It was suggested that the School had clearly outgrown its current site and that there was a real need to pause and reflect on the long-term strategy and future of the School, developing a Master Plan such as created by the City of London Freeman's School, prior to coming to any decision in respect of an expansion within the Barbican Estate. The urgency of a funding decision within the context of the ongoing Fundamental Review and Education Review processes was also queried, with it argued that it would be prudent to wait until the conclusion of these processes, particularly given the significant weight of feeling amongst residents of the Barbican Estate.

A number of Members also spoke in support of the proposal, emphasising the importance of separating the consideration of the budget adjustment from the question of the current expansion proposal and the merits or otherwise of a particular scheme. Whilst it might be simpler or preferable if the three Schools were genuinely independent and could seek loans directly, this was not the case at the present time; therefore, this proposal should be viewed in the context of the funding arrangements utilised for major capital projects at the Schools. It was observed that there had been no objection in respect of the same arrangements for the City of London Freeman's School at Item 16(B) and it was important that the two Schools be treated consistently. Members reiterated that the consideration before the Court was a funding matter and that any approval would not represent a green light for development; whilst there would likely be many objections from residents and other stakeholders, these would be listened to carefully by the School during its consultation process and by the Planning and Transportation Committee during consideration of any planning application, in the event that a proposal materialised. Members urged colleagues to have confidence in the established processes and the relevant committees to discharge their responsibilities appropriately.

Resolved – That approval be granted to an allocation up to £15.3m from the general reserves of City's Cash to provide loan funding for the Girls' School expansion project.

(B) Report of Action Taken: Phase 1 of the Freeman's School Masterplan project – Loan

The Court received a report advising of action taken under urgency procedures in relation to a budget adjustment.

The Policy & Resources Committee and Resource Allocation Sub-Committee had agreed that an internal loan of up to £18.818m to should be granted to the City of London Freeman's School to fund Phase 1 of the School's Masterplan project.

Following that decision, the Finance Committee was required to approve a revision to the Corporation's budget of up to £18.818m to facilitate the loan. In-year budget adjustments of this nature are required to be considered by the Finance Committee, which is responsible for making subsequent recommendations concerning budget adjustments to the Court.

Approval was sought and granted under urgency procedures, to allow for works to be undertaken during the summer holiday period.

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

17.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

(Jeremy Paul Mayhew)

9 July 2019

(A) Capital Funding

The Court was **recommended** to approve additional budgetary provisions of up to £8.463m to fund six schemes agreed for progression outside of the Fundamental Review, namely:

- Corporate IT Service Contract – Outsourcing Transition
- Three Police IT Modernisation Projects (Managed Desktop, Security Zone, and Intranet and Sharepoint delivery)
- Electrical supply works at Walbrook Wharf for electric vehicle charging
- Urgent mechanical and electrical systems works at Walbrook Wharf

These schemes had been approved by the Policy & Resources Committee and Resource Allocation Sub-Committee, following which, the Finance Committee had approved the requisite revisions under urgency procedures. In-year budget adjustments of this nature were required to be considered by the Finance Committee, which was responsible for making subsequent recommendations concerning budget adjustments to the Court.

Resolved – That Members:-

- Approve an allocation of up to £8.463m from the reserves of the relevant

funds (as outlined in the report) to allow the six identified schemes to progress.

- Note that this year's capital funding bids will be assessed initially against the existing prioritisation criteria, pending new criteria to be developed via the Fundamental Review.

(B) Capital Funding – Bid for Reprioritisation: Wanstead Park Ponds

The Court was recommended to approve additional budgetary provisions of up to £150,000 to provide internal loan funding for the engineering assessment and modelling of the Wanstead Park pond system.

The cascading chain of three ponds located at the Park had been designated by the Environment Agency as High Risk under the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 and the City Corporation had a statutory duty to ensure that the pond structures meet the required standards. A sum of £150,000 was, therefore, being sought to undertake an engineering assessment and modelling of the pond system, to determine whether further steps were necessary to bring the Ponds up to standard.

Resolved – That an allocation of £150,000 be approved from the general reserves of City's Cash to provide funding for the engineering assessment and modelling of the pond system.

(C) Capital Funding – Bid for Reprioritisation: Electric Vehicle Replacements to Comply with the Ultra-Low Emission Zone

The Court was **recommended** to approve additional budgetary provisions of up to £3m to provide internal loan funding for electric and other low emission vehicle replacements, in order to comply with the Mayor of London's Ultra Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ) and the City Corporation's 'Transition to a Zero Emission Fleet' policy. This comprised £2.3m from the general reserves of City Fund for Police and other City Fund vehicles, and £0.7m from the general reserves of City's Cash for City's Cash vehicles.

Resolved – That Members:-

- Approve an additional budgetary provision of up to £3m, to provide internal loan funding to be drawn from the general reserves of City Fund and City's Cash.
- Agree that these loan facilities will be available from 2019/20 onwards, to be drawn down as required over the life of the projects subject to other relevant approvals.

18.

BARBICAN RESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE

(Michael Hudson)

17 June 2019

Temporary Reduction in the Quorum

The Barbican Residential Committee (BRC) had experienced difficulty in recruiting non-resident Members and was currently carrying six vacancies, out of the required eleven, leaving future meetings at a high risk of being inquorate. The Court was

recommended to consider a temporary reduction in the quorum of the BRC, from four to three non-resident Members, to ensure that a quorum could be achieved at the scheduled September and December 2019 BRC meetings.

A Member observed that the temporary reduction to the quorum was currently open-ended and proposed an amendment to insert a fixed date on which the quorum would revert to the norm.

Lodge, O.A.W.;
Barr, A.R.M

Amendment – That a temporary reduction to the quorum of the Barbican Residential Committee, from four to three non-resident Members, be agreed until 31 December 2019, to ensure a quorum at the September and December 2019 meetings.

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

Resolved – That a temporary reduction to the quorum of the Barbican Residential Committee, from four to three non-resident Members, be agreed until 31 December 2019, to ensure a quorum at the September and December 2019 meetings.

19. **STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

(Ann Holmes)

3 May 2019

Annual Report

The Court received the annual report of the Standards Committee, advising of its activity between May 2018 and April 2019 period. It was noted that four alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct were considered by the Committee during 2018/19.

The Chairman spoke to introduce the item, following which, a number of Members spoke in relation to the current standards regime. Reference was made to recent email exchanges, with some calling for a more pragmatic and common-sense approach to be taken in respect of dealing with standards matters. A Member also spoke to urge support for the Standards Committee in its efforts to keep the reputation of the City Corporation in high regard.

Dunphy, P.G.;
Broeke, T.

Motion – That the Court proceed to the next item of business, in accordance with Standing Order 11(8).

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

Resolved – That the report be received and its content noted.

20.

Hoffman, T.,
M.B.E., Deputy;
Mayhew, J.P

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

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

21. *Resolved* – That the non-public Minutes of the last Court are correctly recorded.
22. **Policy and Resources Committee**
The Court approved proposals concerning the City of London Primary Academy Islington.
23. **Policy and Resources Committee and Capital Buildings Committee**
The Court approved proposals concerning the Museum of London Relocation Programme.
24. **Property Investment Board**
The Court received a report advising of action taken under urgency procedures concerning the acquisition of a freehold.
25. **Finance Committee**
The Court:-
- a) approved proposals concerning framework contracts for major housing projects;
 - b) noted action taken under urgency procedures concerning the disposal of an element of highway land;
 - c) noted action taken under urgency procedures in relation to borrowing arrangements;
 - d) noted action taken under urgency procedures in relation to the provision of security services; and
 - e) agreed a budget adjustment associated with the obtaining of vacant possession at Smithfield General Market.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and ended at 2.55 pm

BARRADELL.