

**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 Lucy French and Mike Fairmaner (“the Respondents”) in the final Ward List for the Ward of Castle Baynard for 2025 – 2026, as appointed by Fleet Street Quarter BID (“the Company”) at 160 Fetter Lane, London EC4A 2DQ (“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 Respondents in the provisional Ward List. The Respondents did not attend the hearing and did not submit any written representations.

It was not disputed by the Objector that the Company was a qualifying body for the purposes of the City of London (Various Powers) Act 1957 (“the 1957 Act”) and the City of London (Ward Elections) Act 2002 (“the 2002 Act”) and that it was physically occupying the Premises for relevant purposes on 1 September 2024 (the qualifying date).

However, it was disputed that the Company was occupying the Premises as owner or tenant, as required under section 6(1)(c) of the 1957 Act, in order to give rise to a right to appoint one or more voters. A simple licence to occupy premises, with no exclusive possession – such as is often found in shared or serviced workspaces – would not satisfy the relevant requirement. It was also disputed that the Respondents satisfied any of the conditions to be appointed as voters by the Company under section 5 of the 2002 Act.

On the first point, the Objector had submitted a copy of the occupation agreement provided by Workspace, the landlord of the Premises. She asserted that this did not provide exclusive possession and should be construed as a licence. However, having examined the document, I note that it does refer to a letting, rent, and the creation of a tenancy. Having taken legal advice,

I consider that, on a proper construction of the agreement, the occupier has been granted exclusive possession and has a tenancy. The Company therefore satisfies this requirement.

On the second point, the Objector provided evidence to show that the Company had only relocated to the Premises on 1 March 2024, and before that had been based outside the City. On this basis I was satisfied that the Respondents could not satisfy the conditions in section 5 of the 2002 Act that were based on employment by the Company.

There remained the possibility that the Respondents had had their principal or only place of work within the City for an aggregate period of at least ten years. When this was put to the Objector at the hearing, she gave evidence that she knew the Respondents personally and was also aware of their work history from information available on the internet. She undertook to forward further information about this to me after the hearing, which she did.

The Objector also suggested that I could make further enquiries of my own regarding these matters. However, the process for determining objections to registration is evidence based, and an evidential burden is placed on an objector to provide some evidence to support their objections. There is, therefore, a presumption that those who appear in a provisional Ward List are validly registered unless an objector can provide sufficient evidence that they are not. It is not for the Town Clerk to act as an investigator or policeman at this stage.

On this occasion, though, I consider that the Objector has provided enough information to shift the burden of proof onto the Respondents to demonstrate that they ought to be included in the final Ward List. Given that the Respondents have not engaged with this process or provided any evidence, I consider that the Objector has established, on the balance of probabilities, that they ought to be removed. Accordingly, the Respondents will not 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 in a cursive style.

**Greg Moore**  
Deputy Town Clerk