

Gregory Moore
Deputy Town Clerk



Circulated to the Respondent, Objector, and other interested parties

Date 06 February 2025

**Re: City of London Ward Lists – Outcome of hearing
City of London (Various Powers) Act 1957
Representation of the People (England and Wales) Regulations 2001**

I am writing to advise all parties of my decision in relation to the inclusion of Piers Nicholson (“the Respondent”) in the final Ward List for the Ward of Castle Baynard for 2025 – 2026, as appointed by 62 Fleet Street Ltd (“the Company”) at 62 Fleet Street, London EC4Y 1JU (“the Premises”).

A hearing was held on 31 January 2025 at the Guildhall before me, Greg Moore, Deputy Town Clerk, under delegated authority from the Town Clerk and Chief Executive. I was assisted by Edward Wood, Assistant City Solicitor and Alice Loynes, Acting Electoral Services Manager.

In attendance was Martha Grekos (“the Objector”), who had submitted the objection to the inclusion of the Respondent in the provisional Ward List. The Respondent was unable to attend the hearing but submitted written representations.

There was no dispute that the Company owned the freehold of the Premises. However, the Objector claimed that the Company was not occupying the Premises for relevant purposes on 1 September 2024 (the qualifying date), as required under section 6(1)(c) of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1957, in order to give rise to a right to appoint one or more voters. It was also alleged that the Respondent did not satisfy any of the conditions to be appointed as a voter by the Company under section 5 of the City of London (Ward Elections) Act 2002 (“the 2002 Act”).

There was some dispute between the parties as to whether the Company was a letting agency for residential flats or the managing agent for commercial property at the Premises, although either could constitute relevant purposes i.e. a business.

The Objector provided information regarding a previous registered office address for the Company at Companies House up until 30 April 2024 (actually 29 March 2024) and an alternative address for the Company lodged at the Land Registry. However, none of this information was conclusive regarding the actual situation at the Premises on 1 September 2024.

The Objector also claimed that the current director of the Company was not appointed until November 2024 – after the qualifying date. Again, this does not directly speak to the issues to be determined but, to the extent that it is relevant, the records provided show that the current director was appointed on 26 March 2024, shortly after the termination of the Respondent’s own directorship on 22 March 2024.

At the hearing the Objector reiterated her belief that there was no one in physical occupation of the Premises on the Company’s behalf on the qualifying date. However, she conceded that she had not been inside the Premises. As such I can give these observations little weight.

As to the eligibility of the Respondent to be appointed as a voter, the Objector claimed that he had not worked for the Company for the twelve months preceding the qualifying date, and that in any event he had never been in occupation of the Premises though personal physical presence.

For his part the Respondent confirmed that he had been the Company’s managing agent for more than 10 years, prior to the recent sale. He also asserted that he was now an executive agent for the Company, available to help with any matters related to the Company’s work as and when required, and had taken up those duties on the same day that he resigned as a director.

The Objector observed that this evidence was not given under oath, and that the Respondent had not been present at the hearing to answer questions and provide further evidence, which is true. Nevertheless, there is a presumption that those who appear on the provisional Ward List are validly registered unless the Objector can provide sufficient evidence that they are not.

Based on the information currently available to me, it is possible that Respondent could satisfy one or more of the conditions set out in section 5 of the 2002 Act – and without additional information regarding his work history, it is not possible to rule this out. This is the case even though the Respondent can no longer avail himself of the special arrangement for directors under section 5(5) of the 2002 Act.

The Objector sent me some further representations regarding the above matters following the hearing, but the information provided did not alter my conclusions.

I do not therefore consider that the Objector has established, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent ought to be removed. Accordingly, he will be included in the final Ward List for the Ward of Castle Baynard for 2025 – 2026.

There is a right of appeal to the Mayor’s and City of London Court in relation to this decision.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Greg Moore', written over a light blue horizontal line.

Greg Moore
Deputy Town Clerk