



KEAVENY, MAYOR

LUDER, LOCUM TENENS (*ITEMS 17 – 27*)

COURT OF COMMON COUNCIL

9th December 2021
MEMBERS PRESENT

ALDERMEN

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

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

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

COMMONERS

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

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

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

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

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

5. Policy Statement

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

6. Referral

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For the Affirmative – 56

ALDERMEN

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

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

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

COMMONERS

Ameer, R.B.
Barr, A.R.M.

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

Hayward, C.M.
Hoffman, T. D.D., M.B.E.
Deputy
Hudson, M.
Ingham Clark, J., Deputy
Joshi, S.J.
Knowles-Cutler, A.
Lawrence, G.A.
Levene, T.C.

Lord, C.E., O.B.E., J.P., Deputy
Martinelli, P.N.
McGuinness, C.S., Deputy
McMurtrie, A.S., J.P.
Mead, W., O.B.E.
Meyers, A.G.D., Deputy
Mooney, B.D.F., Deputy

Moss, A.M., Deputy
Packham, G.D.

Patel, D., O.B.E.
Pleasance, J.L.
Pollard, J.H.G., Deputy
Regan, R.D., O.B.E., Deputy
Rogula, E., Deputy
de Sausmarez, H.J.

Scott, J.G.S., Deputy
Sells, O.M., Q.C.
Simons, J.L., O.B.E.
Snyder, Sir Michael
Thomson, J.M.D., Deputy
Wright, D.L.
Woodhouse, P.J., Deputy

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

For the Negative – 18

COMMONERS

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. **POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)

18 November 2021

(A) Governance Review: Committee Structure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Court proceeded to debate the report as amended.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Amendment – That:-

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

Brooke, T.;
Anderson, R.K.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

arrangements.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Orders.

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

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

Resolved – That:-

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

(B) Scheme of Delegations

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

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

Resolved – That:-

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

8.

POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE ESTABLISHMENT COMMITTEE

(Deputy Catherine McGuinness)

(Tracey Graham)

18 November 2021

Member / Officer Charter

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

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

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

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

(Deputy Brian Desmond Francis Mooney, Chief Commoner)

Applications for Hospitality

(a) Armed Forces Flag Day 2022

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

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

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

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

(b) London Tourism Awards 2022 Early Evening Reception

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(d) Youth Interfaith Iftar

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

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

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

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

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

(e) Report of Urgent Action Taken: Lunch to celebrate the 25th Anniversary of the founding of UK Sport

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10. LICENSING COMMITTEE

(Sophie Anne Fernandes)

23 November 2021

Statement of Licensing Policy

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

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

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

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

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

11. BRIDGE HOUSE ESTATES BOARD

(Deputy Dr Robert Giles Evelyn Shilson)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12. Freedoms

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

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

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

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

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

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

Read.

Resolved – That this Court doth hereby assent to the admission of the said persons to the Freedom of this City by Redemption upon the terms and in the manner

mentioned in the several Resolutions of this Court, and it is hereby ordered that the Chamberlain do admit them severally to their Freedom accordingly.

13.
Appointments

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

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

Nominations received:-

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

Read.

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

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

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

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

Nominations received:-

Jason Paul Pritchard

Read.

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

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

Nominations received:-

James Richard Tumbridge

Read.

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

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

Nominations received:-

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

Read.

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

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

Nominations received:-

- Paul Nicholas Martinelli

Read.

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

14. Vote of
Thanks,
Late Lord
Mayor

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

WILLIAM ANTHONY BOWATER RUSSELL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

15. Motions There were no Motions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Road Danger Reduction

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

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

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

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

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

Support for Afghan Evacuees

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

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

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

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

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

Electoral Registration – Serviced Offices

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Locum Tenens

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

17. Resolutions There were no resolutions.

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

Bills

Date in force

Environment Act 2021

9 November 2021

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

Statutory Instruments

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

1 November 2021

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

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

4 January 2022

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

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

Read.

19. Hospital Seal There were no docquets to be sealed.

20. Awards & Prizes There was no report.

21. *Resolved* – That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business below on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 3 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act, 1972.

Mooney, B.D.F.,
Deputy; Ingham
Clark, R.J.,
Deputy

Summary of items considered whilst the public were excluded:-

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

23. **Bridge House Estates Board**
The Court approved proposals relating to the disposal of a property.

24. **City of London Police Authority Board, Finance Committee**
The Court approved proposals relating to the increase in contract value of a framework agreement.

25. **Finance Committee**
The Court:-

- (A) Approved proposals relating to IT provision and associated contractual items.
- (B) Noted action taken under urgency procedures relating to the award of a property insurance contract.
- (C) Noted action taken under urgency procedures relative to the award of contracts concerning parking services.

26. **Property Investment Board**

The Court:-

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

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

27. **Policy and Resources Committee**

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

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and ended at 3.35 pm

BARRADELL.