

House of Lords and House of Commons
EXAMINATION OF PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS

GENERAL CEMETERY BILL
NORWICH LIVESTOCK MARKET BILL
MALVERN HILLS BILL
CITY OF LONDON (MARKETS) BILL

Wednesday 18 December 2024

Before:

The Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills:

MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL, Clerk of Private Bills, House of Lords

MS LYNN GARDNER, Clerk of Bills, House of Commons

MR JUSTIN LESLIE, Counsel for Domestic Legislation, House of Commons

Appearing on the Petition for the GENERAL CEMETERY BILL:

MR NICK EVANS of Broadfield Law appeared as the Parliamentary Agent for the Bill.

There also appeared:

MS CATHERINE JOHNSON, Paralegal, Broadfield Law.

MS ARANYA THARUMAKUNARAJAH, Associate, Broadfield Law.

Appearing on the Petition for the NORWICH LIVESTOCK MARKET BILL:

MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH of Broadfield Law appeared as the Parliamentary Agent for the Bill.

There also appeared:

MS CATHERINE JOHNSON, Paralegal, Broadfield Law.

MS ARANYA THARUMAKUNARAJAH, Associate, Broadfield Law.

Appearing on the Petition for the MALVERN HILLS BILL:

MR ALASTAIR LEWIS of Sharpe Pritchard LLP appeared as the Parliamentary Agent for the Bill.

There also appeared:

MS SUSAN SATCHELL, Governance Change Officer, Malvern Hills Trust.

MS NONA ABRAHAM, Planning and Parliamentary Assistant, Sharpe Pritchard.

MR JAMES GOLDTHORPE, Trainee Solicitor, Sharpe Pritchard.

Appearing on the Petition for the CITY OF LONDON (MARKETS) BILL:

MR PAUL WRIGHT, Deputy Remembrancer of the City of London, appeared as the Parliamentary Agent for the Bill.

There also appeared:

MR PAUL DOUBLE, Remembrancer of the City of London.

MR DAVID WALKER, Legislative Compliance Manager, Winckworth Sherwood LLP.

MR PHILIP SAUNDERS, Parliamentary Affairs Counsel, Office of the City Remembrancer.

MS KATIE FOSTER, Senior Parliamentary and Constitutional Affairs Counsel, Office of the City Remembrancer.

MR DANIEL RITCHIE, Billingsgate Market Superintendent.

MR WILLIAM STARK, Senior Parliamentary Engagement Officer, Office of the City Remembrancer.

(I am)

1. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the 2024 examination of private Bills. I am the Clerk of Private Bills in the House of Lords. To my right and left are my fellow Examiners. Lynn, could you begin by introducing yourself?

2. **MS LYNN GARDNER:** Good morning. I am the Clerk of Bills in the Private Bill Office in the House of Commons and one of the Examiners.

3. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Good morning. I am Counsel for Domestic Legislation in the House of Commons.

4. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Today, we have what for us is an unusual number of private Bills. There are four that we are going to deal with today. I believe all those who are involved know the order in which we are going to do them. The first one, if I may, is the General Cemetery Bill. I believe, Mr Evans, you will be speaking to that Bill. You can introduce your colleagues if you wish, or if you wish to do it as you go along that is a matter for you. Let us now go through your proof. Many thanks for providing it early.

5. **MR NICK EVANS:** Good morning, ma'am, and thank you. I am a partner at the law firm Broadfield. I am the parliamentary agent for the General Cemetery Company, which is the promoter of the General Cemetery Bill. I am joined by my colleagues Aranya Tharumakunarah to my right and, to her right, Catherine Johnson.

6. To give a brief word on the name of the law firm, I am currently at the law firm Broadfield. You will see, in a number of the statements in the proof and in the notices, a reference to the previous name of the firm, BDB Pitmans. Our name changed in between the deposit of the Bill and the publication of the notices and today, so we have kept the references in the proofs to the name that was on the notices themselves. We do not think that anyone has been disadvantaged by this change. Our email addresses all auto-divert to the new ones. The office location is still the same, and I believe the signage is still the same. Certainly, the receptionists know to direct people to the right place.

7. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** That is excellent, because I was going to ask you, in respect of this Bill and the other one, whether any provision had been made to ensure that no one was adversely affected by this change in name in terms of communicating with you, but you are satisfied that you have covered all bases.

8. **MR NICK EVANS:** We believe so. Our phone numbers and the physical location are exactly the same. Email addresses are not, but they auto-direct to the new ones.

9. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you very much indeed.

10. **MR NICK EVANS:** If we go through the statement of proofs, you have had handed in to you a folder of exhibits. This contains, at tab A, e-voucher copies of the following newspaper, namely the *West London Gazette*, which circulates in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, and those are copies of Wednesday 4 December and Wednesday 11 December. They contain notice of the application for the Bill.

11. As required by the practice direction of 14 July 2022 regarding the use of e-vouchers, to prove that we have complied with the Standing Orders relating to the content and publication of the notice in newspapers, we also submit, at tab B in the folder exhibits, a letter from Courts Advertising, which confirms the authenticity of those e-vouchers.

12. I prove that each notice contains a concise summary of the purposes of the Bill.

13. I prove that each notice states that, on and after 4 December, a copy of the Bill may be inspected and copies obtained at a reasonable price at BDB Pitmans LLP, One Bartholomew Close, London, EC1A 7BL, in London, and at the office of the General Cemetery Company, Kensal Green Cemetery, Harrow Road, London, W10 4RA, which is an office in the London borough in which the principal office of the promoters of the Bill is situated. In fact, it is their office.

14. I prove that each notice also states the time within which objections may be made by submission of a petition to the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments or the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and that information regarding the submission of such petitions may be obtained from either of those offices or from the agents of the promoters of the Bill.

15. I prove that each notice is headed by the short title of the Bill and is subscribed with the name of the person responsible for the publication of the notice.

16. I prove that each notice contains the website and contact details of the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, of the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and of the agents for the promoters of the Bill. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

17. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.
18. **MR NICK EVANS:** In respect of Standing Order 4A, if you turn to tab C in the folder of the exhibits, there is an affidavit marked “Kelly Louise Farrington”, and she proves, in respect of the General Cemetery Company, Kensal Green Cemetery, Harrow Road. In person, Catherine Johnson will prove in respect of BDB Pitmans. Kelly Louise Farrington, by way of her affidavit, and Catherine Johnson, do you prove that copies of the Bill were made available in the manner and the offices mentioned in the notices?
19. **MS CATHERINE JOHNSON:** I do.
20. **MR NICK EVANS:** I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.
21. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.
22. **MR NICK EVANS:** I prove that Standing Orders 5 to 9 are not applicable to the Bill.
23. In respect of Standing Order 10, I prove that this Bill is not promoted by a local or joint authority.
24. I prove that the principal office of the General Cemetery Company, promoting the Bill, is situated in the London borough, the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.
25. I prove that the newspaper notice that was at tab A, previously handed in, was duly published in the area of that local authority, once in each of two consecutive weeks, with an interval of not less than six clear days between the two publication dates, and the second publication being not later than 11 December.
26. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.
27. **MR NICK EVANS:** I prove that those newspaper notices are in the same terms, and I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.
28. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.
29. **MR NICK EVANS:** I prove that Standing Order 10A is not applicable to the Bill.
30. In respect of Standing Order 11, if you turn to tab D, you can find a copy of the *London Gazette* of Tuesday 3 December. That contains a notice of the Bill, and it was also published online on Monday 2 December 2024. I prove that such notice was published not later than 11 December.

31. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.

32. **MR NICK EVANS:** I prove that the notice states the short title of the Bill, the time within which objection may be made by submission of a petition to the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments or the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and that information regarding the submission of the petitions may be obtained from either of those offices or from the agents for the promoters of the Bill, and that the notice states the offices at which copies of the Bill may be inspected and obtained, mentioned in the full notice. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

33. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.

34. **MR NICK EVANS:** I prove that Standing Orders 12 to 18 are not applicable to the Bill.

35. In respect of Standing Order 19, in the folder of exhibits at tab E, you can find the list that is marked with the delivery receipts attached thereto and signed by Ms Johnson. Ms Johnson, do you prove that, on or before 11 December 2024, as regards the list shown in the folder at tab E, you gave notice in writing to the parties mentioned in the list, in accordance with Standing Orders 22 and 24, that stated the intention to apply for a Bill, whereby it is proposed to alter or repeal any express statutory provision now in force for the protection or benefit of any public trustees or commissioners, corporation or other person specifically named in such provision?

36. **MS CATHERINE JOHNSON:** I do.

37. **MR NICK EVANS:** I prove that the list contains the names of all the persons for the time being entitled to enforce any such statutory provision, except those persons whose identity could not, after reasonable inquiry, be ascertained.

38. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Now, I know that is the formula in the Standing Order about not being able to ascertain persons. Were there any persons that you suspect you could not ascertain?

39. **MR NICK EVANS:** The three persons who we served were the Bishop of London—and we know it was the diocese—and the two local authorities that cover the cemetery. The person who has the benefit of the protection in the 1832 Act is commissioner of sewers for Middlesex and Westminster, for which we believe the relevant functions now sit with the local authorities. As far as we could ascertain, the local authorities were the right person to serve in this case.

40. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.

41. **MR NICK EVANS:** There were no other people who benefited.

42. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.

43. **MR NICK EVANS:** Ms Johnson, do you prove, in the case of the notices forwarded by post and shown in the list, that those notices were posted on or before 8 December 2024, and that none of the letters was returned by the Post Office as undelivered?

44. **MS CATHERINE JOHNSON:** I do.

45. **MR NICK EVANS:** I prove that the list at tab E contains the names of all the persons for the time being entitled to enforce any express statutory provision now in force for the protection of those persons specifically named in such provision that is proposed to be altered or repealed, except those persons whose identity could not, after reasonable inquiry, be ascertained, which we have just discussed. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

46. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** This may be a rather pedantic point on the proof, but do you see the third paragraph down beginning, “prove that the list contains”, and then the fifth paragraph down, “prove that the list at tab E contains”, et cetera? What is the difference between those two paragraphs? It is not clear to me why they are both needed. You may say that such are the foibles of the proof that it is just as it is, but I just wondered.

47. **MR NICK EVANS:** It is a very good question, and it could well be one of the foibles of the proof.

48. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Yes. Proofs are full of them.

49. **MR NICK EVANS:** Standing Order 19 does not come up that often, so I have not been able to get much guidance for it.

50. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** You do not see them as having a different purpose.

51. **MR NICK EVANS:** Not in the case of this Bill, no.

52. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Okay, that is absolutely fine. Thank you very much.

53. **MR NICK EVANS:** I prove that Standing Order 19A is not applicable to the Bill, and that Standing Order 19B is not applicable to the Bill.

54. I prove that Standing Order 20 is not applicable to the Bill.

55. I prove that Standing Orders 21 and 25 are not applicable to the Bill.

56. Standing Orders 22 to 24 do not need to be proved separately.

57. I prove that Standing Order 25A is not applicable to the Bill because it is not promoted by any of the named bodies.

58. Standing Order 26 does not have to be approved separately.

59. I prove that Standing Orders 27 to 37 are not applicable to the Bill.

60. In the case of Standing Order 38, Ms Tharumakunarah, do you prove that, on or before 27 November 2024, you deposited, in accordance with Standing Order 26, Standing Order 201 of the House of Lords, and Standing Order 209 of the House of Commons, a printed copy of the Bill in the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, in the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and in the Vote Office?

61. **MS ARANYA THARUMAKUNARAJAH:** I do.

62. **MR NICK EVANS:** Do you prove that the title of the Bill contains the reference required by House of Lords Standing Order 38(5)?

63. **MS ARANYA THARUMAKUNARAJAH:** I do.

64. **MR NICK EVANS:** Do you prove that there is attached to every copy of the Bill a printed memorandum describing the Bill generally and, subject to Standing Order 38(4), every clause in the Bill, and including a statement of opinion by or on behalf of the promoters as to the compatibility of the provisions of the Bill with the convention rights as defined in the Human Rights Act 1998?

65. **MS ARANYA THARUMAKUNARAJAH:** I do.

66. **MR NICK EVANS:** I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

67. In respect of Standing Order 39, Ms Johnson, do you prove that, on or before 4 December 2024, you deposited electronically, as specified in the list kept under Standing Order 1A, and in accordance with Standing Order 26, copies of the Bill, evidence of those deposits having been served on and received by the requisite government departments and public bodies, together with evidence that those government departments and public bodies gave permission to be served electronically, being found in the folder of exhibits at tab F and numbers 1 to 21?

68. **MS CATHERINE JOHNSON:** I do.

69. **MR NICK EVANS:** Ms Johnson, do you prove that those deposits are the only deposits required to be made under Standing Order 39?

70. **MS CATHERINE JOHNSON:** I do.

71. **MR NICK EVANS:** I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

72. I prove that Standing Order 41 is not applicable to the Bill.

73. I prove that Standing Orders 42 and 43 are not applicable to the Bill.

74. I prove that Standing Order 44 is not applicable to the Bill.

75. I prove that Standing Orders 45 and 47 to 59 are not applicable to the Bill.

76. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you. Unless my colleagues have any questions, that concludes the examination of the General Cemetery Bill, and we find that the Standing Orders applicable to the Bill have been complied with.

77. We will now turn to the Norwich Livestock Market Bill. I believe that you all stay in place, since, Mr Latif-Aramesh, you are sitting there. I am going to hand over to my colleague on my left.

78. **MS LYNN GARDNER:** Thank you. Can I invite you to take us through the Bill?

79. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** Yes. Good morning. If I could just start with an apology, I am on the precipice of losing my voice, so, if I start to sound like a frog, please just stop me and I will try to humanise as we go through the proof. Can I just check that you have a copy of the folder that relates to the Norwich Livestock Market Bill?

80. **MS LYNN GARDNER:** We do.

81. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** Thank you. At tab A, you will find e-vouchers, which contain copies of the following newspapers, namely the *Eastern Daily Press*, which circulates in Norwich, of 2 December and 9 December, containing notice of an application for the Bill.

82. As required by the practice direction dated 14 July 2022 regarding the use of e-vouchers as proof of compliance with the Standing Orders relating to the content and publication of the notices in those newspapers, we also submit evidence at tab B, a letter from Courts Advertising confirming the authenticity of the e-voucher copies.

83. I prove that each notice contains a concise summary of the purposes of the Bill. I should say, for completeness, that I am also a partner at Broadfield, for the record, so Mr Evans' comments regarding the name change from BDB Pitmans to Broadfield are applicable here, and those notices reference BDB Pitmans for the same reasons that Mr Evans set out.

84. I prove that each notice states that, on and after 4 December, a copy of the Bill may be inspected and copies may be obtained at a reasonable price at BDB Pitmans in London and at the office of Norwich City Council, which is at City Hall, St Peters Street, Norwich, Norfolk, NR2 1NH, being an office in the area of the district council.

85. I prove that each notice also states the time within which objections may be made by submission of a petition to the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments or the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and that information regarding the submission of petitions may be obtained from either of those offices or from the agents for the promoters of the Bill.

86. I prove that each notice is headed by the short title of the Bill and is subscribed with the name of the person responsible for the publication of the notice.

87. I prove that each notice contains the website and contact details of the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, of the Private Bill Office and of the website of the promoters of the Bill, and the contact details for the agents for the promoters of the Bill. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

88. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Could I ask two questions? The first is just for clarity. There is reference to Norwich City Council and to the district council. Norwich City Council is the promoter of this Bill, although, in the proof, you refer to the district council being the promoter of the Bill. They are the same thing.

89. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** They are the same thing. Norwich City Council exists in a two-tier governmental system, so it is the district council for the area. Norfolk County Council is the county council for the area, but that is the district council. It is one and the same.

90. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** That is really helpful. My second point is this. Going ahead slightly to Standing Order 10, you refer to the Bill altering the functions of Norwich City Council.

91. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** Yes. We say that it alters the functions primarily on the basis that the Norwich City Council Act 1984 gives it the function of providing a market in the city centre, and so, out of an abundance of caution, we say that we are affecting that function because it can provide a market outside of the city centre.

92. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Yes, and that seems a very sensible approach. I only raise it because, in the list on page 2 of the proof in relation to

Standing Order 4, there are a number of paragraphs, A to H, and you have deleted E, which refers to an office in the area of the council whose functions are altered by the Bill. Am I right in assuming that you have deleted that because it would be surplus to requirements, since what you have to do under the Standing Orders is fully satisfied by paragraph D?

93. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** That is correct. It would be the same office that would be referenced in paragraph E, so it is surplus to requirements.

94. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.

95. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** In relation to Standing Order 4A, you will find, in the folder at tab C, the affidavit of Mark Fitzsimmons in respect of the inspection location at the council's offices at St Peters Street and, in person, Ms Catherine Johnson in respect of the inspection being available at the offices of BDB Pitmans. Mark Fitzsimmons, by way of affidavit, and Catherine Johnson will prove that copies of the Bill were made available. Ms Johnson, can I ask you to confirm that copies of the Bill were made available in the manner and at the offices of BDB Pitmans mentioned in the notices?

96. **MS CATHERINE JOHNSON:** Yes, I do prove that.

97. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

98. I prove that Standing Orders 5 to 9 are not applicable to the Bill.

99. In relation to Standing Order 10, which we have just briefly discussed, I prove that the Bill is promoted by the district council, namely Norwich City Council.

100. I prove that the newspaper notice marked at tab A in the folder that you have been handed was duly published in the area of the said local authority once in each of two consecutive weeks, with an interval of not less than six days between the two publication dates, the second publication date not being later than 11 December.

101. I prove that the Bill alters the functions of Norwich City Council.

102. I prove that the newspaper notice marked at tab A in the folder was duly published in the area of the said district once in each of two consecutive weeks, with an interval of not less than six days, the second publication not being later than 11 December. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

103. In relation to Standing Order 10A, I prove that this Standing Order is not applicable to the Bill.

104. In relation to Standing Order 11, in the folder at tab D, you can find a notice published in the *London Gazette* on Tuesday 3 December containing notice of the Bill. It was also published online on 2 December. I prove that each notice was published not later than 11 December, and I prove that each notice states the short title of the Bill, the time within which the objection may be made by submission of a petition to the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments or the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and that information regarding the submission of such petitions may be obtained from either of those offices or from the agents of the promoters of the Bill. The notices also state the offices at which copies of the Bill may be inspected and obtained, as mentioned in the full notice. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

105. I prove that Standing Orders 12 to 18 are not applicable to the Bill.

106. In relation to Standing Order 19, I prove that this Standing Order is not applicable to the Bill. For completeness, I did just want to pause there, just to explain that, unlike other markets that operate in the country, there is not a statutory body that is specifically named or has the benefit of a protected provision. There is not, for example, a statutory consultative committee, as there is with other markets. The Norwich City Council Act 1984 does not, in fact, name an owner, lessee, occupier or some other organisation that has the benefit of a statutory provision, and the Bill does not propose to repeal or otherwise alter those provisions in any event.

107. As a courtesy—and I emphasise as a courtesy—we served a copy of the Bill and a summary of the notice that was published in the newspapers to an organisation called Norwich Livestock Market Ltd, which undertakes the day-to-day operations, even though it is not named in the 1984 Act. We also served a copy of the Bill and the notice to the freehold owner of the land in which the market is currently situated. Again, we do not consider that Standing Order 19 applies, but we have done that as a courtesy, notwithstanding that there is no express statutory provision for its benefit that exists at all, let alone one that is being repealed or altered.

108. I prove that Standing Order 19A is not applicable to this Bill.

109. I prove that Standing Order 19B is not applicable to this Bill.

110. I prove that Standing Order 20 is not applicable to the Bill.

111. I prove that Standing Orders 21 and 25 are not applicable to the Bill.

112. I prove that Standing Order 25A is not applicable to the Bill, because it is not promoted by the Greater London Authority, Transport for London, the London Development Agency or the council of a London borough.

113. I prove that Standing Orders 27 to 37 are not applicable to the Bill.

114. In relation to Standing Order 38, I prove that, on or before 27 November, I deposited, in accordance with Standing Order 26, Standing Order 201 of the House of Lords and Standing Order 209 of the House of Commons, a printed copy of the Bill in the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, in the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and in the Vote Office.

115. I prove that there is attached to every copy of the Bill a printed memorandum describing the Bill generally and, subject to Standing Order 38(4), every clause in the Bill, and it includes a statement by or on behalf of the promoters as to the compatibility of the provisions of the Bill with the convention rights as defined in the Human Rights Act. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

116. In relation to Standing Order 39, Ms Catherine Johnson, do you prove that, on or before 4 December, you deposited, as specified in the appropriate list kept under Standing Order 1A and in accordance with Standing Order 26, copies of the Bill?

117. **MS CATHERINE JOHNSON:** I do.

118. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** Just for completeness, you will find, in the folder of exhibits, that we have the acknowledgements in relation to the Norwich Livestock Market specifically, but also an acceptance of the use of electronic deposits, some of which were obtained in relation to the Bishop's Stortford Cemetery private Bill. There were three government departments where, again out of an abundance of caution, we sought formal acceptance of email deposits, primarily because the government department did not exist or was restructured in some way between 2022 and now, so you will find that in the deposit. Ms Catherine Johnson, do you prove that those are the only deposits required to be made under Standing Order 39?

119. **MS CATHERINE JOHNSON:** I do.

120. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

121. **MS LYNN GARDNER:** Thank you. Just for the record, could you confirm that all the departments that you approached agreed that electronic copies from now on would be acceptable?

122. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** That is correct.
123. **MS LYNN GARDNER:** Thank you.
124. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** I prove that Standing Order 41 is not applicable to the Bill.
125. I prove that Standing Orders 42 and 43 are not applicable to the Bill.
126. I prove that Standing Order 44 is not applicable to the Bill.
127. Finally, I prove that Standing Orders 45 and 47 to 59 are not applicable to the Bill.
128. **MS LYNN GARDNER:** Thank you very much.
129. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Could I ask one question, please, in relation to the emails with government departments? Just looking at tab 9, there is an exchange with DSIT. I just wondered if you could explain whether it is significant that Catherine Johnson's last email went unreplied?
130. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** The email exchange at tab 9 relates to an additional request to forward on a copy of the Bill. In accordance with the Standing Order 1A list, there was an acknowledgement of receipt by DSIT at the specified email address. We understand that, from the email that it then asked us to forward it on to, we had a receipt, but because it is not an email address that is specified under Standing Order 1A it is not something that we then laid into the folder.
131. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you.
132. **MS LYNN GARDNER:** Thank you very much. I find that the Standing Orders applicable to this Bill have been complied with. Thank you.
133. **MR MUSTAFA LATIF-ARAMESH:** Thank you.
134. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** So we are on to number three and many thanks for attending today, those who are now leaving us.
135. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** We come now to the Malvern Hills Bill. Mr Lewis, before we start, are there any papers that we need to have in front of us?
136. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I was going to hand them up in the traditional, old style as they were introduced, but we could hand them all up now. I am afraid I have only one copy of each.
137. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** It is entirely a matter for you.
138. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I think they have been sent in advance—most of them, in any event. Maybe if Mr Goldthorpe hands them all up now, we will save him

jumping up and down for the whole of the proceedings. While I am doing that, shall I introduce those with me?

139. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Please, yes.

140. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I am from the firm Sharpe Pritchard LLP, and I am the agent for the promoters of this Bill. To my right sits James Goldthorpe, who is a colleague of mine at Sharpe Pritchard, a trainee solicitor. To his right is Nona Abrahams, who is a parliamentary assistant at Sharpe Pritchard. To her right is Susan Satchell, who is the governance change officer at the Malvern Hills Trust.

141. I have called it the Malvern Hills Trust, because that is its working name. Just as an explanation, the formal statutory name of the organisation promoting the Bill is the Malvern Hills Conservators and, as you may have seen from the Bill, one of the purposes of the Bill is to change its name from the Malvern Hills Conservators to the Malvern Hills Trust.

142. Would you like me to start going through the proofs?

143. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Yes, please. Thank you.

144. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** Together with the letter from Courts Advertising, referred to in the previous examination, e-vouchers of the copies of the *Times* newspaper circulating in the district of Malvern Hills, the county of Worcestershire and the district of Herefordshire, dated 2 December 2024 and 9 December 2024, together with originals of the *Ledbury Recorder* circulating in the district of Herefordshire of 29 November 2024 and 6 December 2024, and originals of the *Malvern Gazette* circulating in the district of Malvern and the county of Worcestershire of 29 November 2024 and 6 December 2024, have all been handed up.

145. I might add that we could have just given you copies of the *Times*, because, of course, that circulates everywhere, but—well, not really out of an abundance of caution, but to enable, perhaps, the local residents to have a better opportunity of knowing about the Bill—we took the decision to also publish in the local newspapers that circulate in the local area. Each of those notices contains notice of the application for the Bill.

146. I prove that each notice contains a concise summary of the purposes of the Bill.

147. I prove that each notice states that, on and after 4 December 2024, a copy of the Bill may be inspected and copies obtained at a reasonable price at the offices of

Sharpe Pritchard LLP, Elm Yard, 10-16 Elm Street, London, WC1X 0BJ, in London, and at the offices of the Malvern Hills Trust, Manor House, Grange Road, Malvern, Worcestershire, WR14 3EY, being an office in the area of the council of the county of Worcestershire, and in the area of the council of the district of Malvern Hills, whose or whose members' or officers' functions are altered by the Bill, and the offices of Herefordshire Council, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford, HR1 2DU, being an office in the area of the County of Herefordshire District Council, whose or whose members' or officers' functions are altered by the Bill.

148. I might pause there, because you may ask a similar question about the status of Herefordshire district council, and it is one that you do have to do a little bit of research on. Even though it sounds like it should be a county council, it is what is called a unitary authority and, as such, is a district council, and so that is why we refer to it as a district council. I think its formal name, to add more confusion, is the County of Herefordshire District Council, but, for these purposes, we are taking it as a district council, which it is.

149. Also named are the offices of the Malvern Hills Trust, Manor House, Grange Road, Malvern, Worcestershire, WR14 3EY, being an office in the county in which the principal office of the promoter of the Bill is situated.

150. I prove that each notice also states the time within which objections may be made by submission of a petition to the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments or the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and that information regarding the submission of such petitions may be obtained from either of those offices or from the agents for the promoters.

151. I prove that each notice is headed by the short title of the Bill and is subscribed with the name of the person responsible for the publication of the notice.

152. I prove that each notice contains the website and contact details of the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, of the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and of the agents for the promoters. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

153. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you. I have one very small point. On your proof, on the first page, you have listed the papers that you put notices in. In the first line, relating to the *Times*, you refer to the district of Malvern Hills.

154. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** Yes.

155. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** In relation to the *Malvern Gazette*, you have referred to the district of Malvern.

156. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I am afraid that is a typographical error on my part. I do beg your pardon for that.

157. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you for that.

158. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I thought I had corrected that one. It is the district of Malvern Hills, for the record.

159. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you.

160. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** You have before you now an affidavit marked number 1, I hope, which is the affidavit of David Price. I prove as to London. David Price, by his affidavit, proves as to Hereford. Susan Satchell, as to Malvern, do you prove that copies of the Bill were made available in the manner and at the offices mentioned in the notices?

161. **MS SUSAN SACHELL:** I do.

162. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** Just to make clear, I prove that as to London. I consider that Standing Order 4A has been complied with.

163. I prove that Standing Orders 5 to 9 are not applicable to the Bill.

164. On Standing Order 10, I prove that the Bill alters functions of the councils of the county of Worcestershire, the district of Herefordshire and the district of Malvern Hills, and the parishes of Colwall and Mathon. As an example of that, in case you are interested, each of those authorities has power under the existing Malvern Hills legislation to nominate conservators. As you know, one of the purposes of the Bill is to repeal all the Malvern Hills legislation, so clearly that is a provision that has been repealed. There are one or two other cases where the functions of some of the councils have been altered as well. I was not intending to go through them all one by one, but that gives you an example of the sort of alteration that we are talking about.

165. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you.

166. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I prove that the newspaper notices previously handed in were duly published in the area of the said local authorities once in each of two consecutive weeks, with an interval of not less than six clear days between the two publication dates, the second publication being not later than 11 December 2024, and I prove that the several newspaper notices are in the same terms.

167. I prove that the Bill is not promoted by a local or joint authority, and I consider that the Standing Order has been complied with.

168. I prove that Standing Order 10A is not applicable to the Bill.

169. In respect of Standing Order 11, you have, with the bundle of papers, the e-voucher of the *London Gazette*, together with the letter from Courts Advertising, and the notice dated 29 November 2024 containing a notice of the Bill. I prove that the notice was published not later than 11 December 2024.

170. I prove that the notice states the short title of the Bill, the time within which objection may be made by submission of a petition to the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments or the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and that information regarding the submission of such petitions may be obtained from either of those offices or from the agents for the promoters, and the offices at which copies of the Bill may be inspected and obtained, mentioned in the full notice. I consider that Standing Order 11 has been complied with.

171. I prove that Standing Orders 12 to 18 are not applicable to the Bill.

172. In respect of Standing Order 19, you have in front of you a list marked A, with Post Office receipts attached thereto, signed by the witness, Mr Goldthorpe. Mr Goldthorpe, do you prove that, in the case of the notices forwarded by post, which comprises the whole list, and shown in list marked A, such notices were posted on or before 8 December 2024, and that none of such letters was returned by the Post Office as undelivered?

173. **MR JAMES GOLDTHORPE:** I do.

174. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I prove that the list marked A contains the names of all the persons for the time being entitled to enforce any express statutory provision now in force for the protection of the owner or reputed owner, lessee or reputed lessee, or occupier of any specifically designated property, and the protection or benefit of any public trustees or commissioners, corporation or other person specifically named in such provision that is proposed to be altered or repealed, except those persons whose identity could not, after reasonable inquiry, be ascertained. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

175. I think you may have some questions on this, because, with a Bill of this nature, which repeals a number of enactments, we had to consider very carefully who needed to be served in respect of which provision. The list runs to, I think, 27 notices

served on various people. We had a very helpful discussion before today about, in particular, one of the parties concerned, the Crown Estate commissioners, who were served in relation to those provisions in the various legislation that provide protection for the monarch and for the Crown.

176. After deliberation, I considered that this is an unprecedented situation as far as I was concerned, and I asked others with experience as well, as to whether His Majesty should be served with a repeal notice. In the end, we decided not. One of the reasons is that, in a sense, if the royal prerogative is affected by a Bill, that brings into mind the need for King's consent, and I am now in dialogue with the relevant government department about whether King's consent should be obtained.

177. In a sense, His Majesty has the ability, through that procedure, to express concerns, if he has any, about the repeal of the protection that was contained in the four Acts in which the protective provisions were contained. In my view, I believe that we have done all we can to meet the requirements of the Standing Order in relation to those protected provisions.

178. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you for that. Shall we just have a quick look at Standing Order 19, in that case, so that we know the basis on which we are proceeding? I will just let you get that up, if you need to, once we have refreshed our memories of it. Is the analysis that those interests may be affected but we are dealing with an exceptional case here that takes us outside the Standing Orders?

179. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I think we are. That is my view. I do not think that we could argue that the interests of the monarch are unaffected, because we are repealing a protected provision that is in the name of the monarch. One of the purposes—I may venture to suggest, the main purpose—of serving a repeal notice is to draw the attention of the recipients to the ability to petition against the Bill. In fact, in the standard form of repeal notice, one has to attach the relevant Standing Orders about how to petition against the Bill. Of course, I think it is out of the question that His Majesty would deposit a petition against a Bill. That, allied with my explanation just now about the fact that His Majesty's interests are protected by the fact that he can withhold King's consent at Third Reading, does, I suggest, put him in a different category from other people who are protected.

180. I accept that the Crown Estate commissioners are a different, separate body, in the sense that they deal with different aspects of Crown property, and would not

expect them to draw the attention of the Bill to His Majesty, but the way that I see it is through those other procedures that I have mentioned. Certainly, His Majesty has the ability to, if you like, make his views known at Third Reading.

181. As for the idea of serving the palace, I am not saying that that is out of the question, but I think it would be highly unusual. As far as I am concerned, it is not something I have come across in the 30 years that I have been doing this job. I do not know whether anyone else has been in that position.

182. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you. Unless we have more questions—

183. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** I have a different question on the same Standing Order.

184. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** The point I was just going to make was that we will need to confer about this point. At the end of your proof, we will have a short adjournment and then come back, but are there further questions?

185. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** It is the question I asked during the course of the previous examination. Are there any people whose identity you could not identify?

186. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** No. As I said, we went through, very carefully, each provision of the Bill. In order to see if we could find if there were any hidden people affected, there was a notice published in October, in two successive weeks, asking for people who considered that they were affected by certain provisions of the Bill to come forward. Again, completely out of an abundance of caution, we decided to take that step. We had one or two replies—two replies, I think it was—and considered them very carefully.

187. We took the view that neither of the people who responded—and I do not think that they were necessarily claiming that they were specifically directly affected in the way that Standing Order 19 reads—did not need to be served notice, but we are confident that we have served everyone.

188. One of the reasons, if I may explain, that we have not served notice in respect of every single section that is being repealed is that, in some cases, the provisions that provided protection are clearly spent, so nobody could enforce them any more. In other cases, they involved land that was, back in 1884 or 1924, in the ownership of somebody else but is now in the ownership of the trust, because it has since bought the land. I think it would have been a real overabundance of caution if we had served

ourselves, and so we did not serve ourselves with repeal notices—though I have to say, we considered it, but, in the end, we decided that it was not necessary. We are confident that we have included everyone.

189. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** That is extremely helpful. Thank you. Again, just for completeness, I notice in the proof you refer to both 19A and 19B—one to do with property and one to do with protection of benefit of public trustees, et cetera. Both apply in this case.

190. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** They do. They apply in this case, because, for example, in one case, there is an estate that is affected by the Bill in terms of the land, so we served notices on the owners of that land, although they were not specifically named in the provision. In other cases—for example, those provisions that specifically name the district and county councils—that was the paragraph B-type notice.

191. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you very much.

192. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** In some cases, I think there may even have been people who fell into both categories, but I am not sure.

193. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Could I ask just a couple of questions on the very helpful table that you have provided? It is very helpful to have the repeals specified that give rise to the need for the notice. On Nos. 23, 26 and 27, you have referred to Section 56 of the Malvern Hills Act 1924, and that refers to a provision that deals with the protection of William Berington of Little Malvern Court. Just for my own clarity, is the point that those three individuals are successors in title law?

194. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** That is right. We have had some very helpful correspondence with the solicitors to the Little Malvern Court estate about this, and they were very co-operative in providing us with the relevant addresses of the current owners of the Little Malvern Court estate, which, as you say, is the land. This would fall into paragraph A of the two. The land is protected by Section 56—or partially, because quite a bit of Section 56 is spent itself, but there are one or two subsections there that still could, in theory, be enforced.

195. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you.

196. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I think that completes Standing Order 19.

197. I prove that Standing Order 19A is not applicable to the Bill.

198. I prove that Standing Order 19B is not applicable to the Bill

199. I prove that Standing Order 20 is not applicable to the Bill.

200. I prove that Standing Orders 21 and 25 are not applicable to the Bill.

201. I prove that Standing Order 25A is not applicable to the Bill, because it is not promoted by the Greater London Authority, Transport for London, the London Development Agency or the council of a London borough.

202. I prove that Standing Orders 27 to 37 are not applicable to the Bill.

203. I prove that, on or before 27 November 2024, I deposited, in accordance with Standing Order 26, Standing Order 201 of the House of Lords, and Standing Order 209 of the House of Commons, a printed copy of the Bill in the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, in the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and in the Vote Office.

204. I prove that there is attached to every copy of the Bill a printed memorandum describing the Bill generally and, subject to Standing Order 38(4), every clause in the Bill, including a statement of opinion by or on behalf of the promoters as to the compatibility of the provisions of the Bill with the convention rights as defined in the Human Rights Act 1998. I consider that Standing Order 38 has been complied with.

205. In respect of Standing Order 39, Nona Abrahams, do you prove that, on or before 4 December 2024, you deposited, as specified in the appropriate list kept under Standing Order 1A, and in accordance with Standing Order 26, copies of the Bill?

206. **MS NONA ABRAHAMS:** I do.

207. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** You have a bundle there with a table at the front, setting out the names of all the departments that were contacted. Picking up on the lead of Mr Latif-Aramesh and his Bishop's Stortford Bill, we have also asked the departments, for future reference, to give, if you like, a blanket yes to electronic deposits for future Bills, were we lucky enough to promote another one in the future. Most, but not all, have responded to that positively, but we will keep trying.

208. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you.

209. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I prove that those deposits are the only deposits required to be made under Standing Order 39. I consider that Standing Order 39 has been complied with.

210. **MS LYNN GARDNER:** On your table, it says, as you have just drawn our attention to, that several of these departments have not expressly agreed to future Bills being deposited electronically.

211. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** Not yet, no.

212. **MS LYNN GARDNER:** We have just dealt with this matter in the previous Bills. What are your plans to follow up on that?

213. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I think we will try. There is no great urgency to do that now, but I would like to think that we would like to get all the departments in line if we can. We were mainly focused on making sure that we got this Bill over the line. Everyone said yes to electronic deposits for this Bill. I suspect that some people may have missed the second question. I hope that there was not a deliberate refusal for future Bills. We will try, and if we do not succeed then so be it. We will have to ask again next time round.

214. In respect of Standing Order 41, referring back to the list of repeal notices marked A, with the Post Office receipts attached and signed by the witness Mr Goldthorpe, the list includes, you will see, the names of Worcestershire County Council and Herefordshire Council. They have been included for your information because of Clause 48 of the Bill, which would allow the Malvern Hills Trust to erect fencing and other means of enclosure to stop livestock straying from the common.

215. Those other means of enclosure could include cattle grids, and could include cattle grids on public highways, with the consent of the highway authority, I should add. It is not really an abundance of caution; I think this Standing Order does apply, because of that. That is the reason for, rather unusually, referring to this particular Standing Order in what is, of course, a non-works Bill.

216. Mr Goldthorpe, do you prove that, on or before 1 December 2024, you posted by a registered post service, addressed with sufficient directions, a copy of the Bill to the two recipients specified in Standing Order 1A, and that none of such copies was returned by the Post Office as undelivered?

217. **MR JAMES GOLDTHORPE:** I do.

218. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** I prove that the list marked A, so far as it mentions those two councils, contains the name of every recipient or recipients specified in Standing Order 1A, and I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

219. I prove that Standing Orders 42 and 43 are not applicable to the Bill.

220. I prove that Standing Order 44 is not applicable to the Bill.

221. I prove that Standing Orders 45 and 47 to 59 are not applicable to the Bill.

222. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you. As I mentioned earlier, we need a bit of time just to confer regarding the Standing Order 19 point. If I can just ask everyone to clear the room for a moment, we will return shortly.

The Examiners adjourned for deliberation from 12.05 pm to 12.25 pm.

223. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you for your patience, everyone. Mr Lewis, I am pleased to say that we find that the Standing Orders applicable to this Bill have been complied with.

224. **MR ALASTAIR LEWIS:** Thank you very much.

225. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** We will shortly move on to our final Bill, which is the City of London (Markets) Bill, but we will just let everyone assume their places.

226. Mr Wright, we will launch immediately into your Bill, the City of London (Markets) Bill. Could you take us through the proof, which—and many thanks—you have supplied in advance?

227. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Mr Walker has handed in the following newspapers: the *Times* circulating in the City of London of 29 November and 6 December 2024, marked severally 1 and 2, containing notice of the application for the Bill. For the record, although we do not have a copy for you this morning, and not required under the Standing Orders, the notice was also published in the *Metro* on the same day, a local newspaper circulating in the area.

228. I prove that each notice contains a concise summary of the purposes of the Bill.

229. I prove that each notice states that, on or after 4 December 2024, a copy of the Bill may be inspected and copies obtained at a reasonable price at the Office of the City Remembrancer, Guildhall, Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7HH, in London, and also being an office in the area of the corporation that is promoting the Bill.

230. I prove that each notice also states the time within which objections may be made by submission of a petition to the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments or the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and that information regarding the submission of such petitions may be obtained from either of those offices or from the agents for the promoters.

231. I prove that each notice is headed by the short title of the Bill and subscribed with the name of the person responsible for the publication of the notice.

232. I prove that each notice contains the website and contact details of the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, of the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and of the agents for the promoters. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

233. Moving on to Standing Order 4A, I prove that copies of the Bill were made available in the manner and at the offices mentioned in the notices, and I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

234. I prove that Standing Orders 5 to 9 are not applicable to this Bill.

235. In respect of Standing Order 10, Mr Double, do you prove that this Bill is not promoted by a local or joint authority?

236. **MR PAUL DOUBLE:** I so prove.

237. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Mr Double, do you prove that the principal office of the corporation promoting the Bill is situated in the City of London?

238. **MR PAUL DOUBLE:** I so prove.

239. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Mr Walker, do you prove that the newspaper notice marked severally 1 and 2, previously handed in, was duly published in the area of the said city, once in each of two consecutive weeks, with an interval of not less than six clear days between the two publication dates, the second publication being not later than 11 December 2024?

240. **MR DAVID WALKER:** I do.

241. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Do you prove that the several newspaper notices are in the same terms?

242. **MR DAVID WALKER:** Yes, they are.

243. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

244. I prove that Standing Order 10A is not applicable to the Bill.

245. Mr Walker has produced a copy of the *London Gazette* of 2 December 2024, containing a notice of the Bill. Mr Walker, do you prove that such notice was published not later than 11 December 2024?

246. **MR DAVID WALKER:** I do.

247. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** I prove that such notice states the short title of the Bill, the time within which objection may be made by submission of a petition to the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments or the Private Bill Office of the House of

Commons, and that information regarding the submission of such petitions may be obtained from either of those offices or from the agents for the promoters, and the offices at which copies of the Bill may be inspected and obtained, mentioned in the full notice. I consider that the Standing Order has been complied with.

248. I prove that Standing Orders 12 to 18 are not applicable to the Bill.

249. Mr Walker has handed in lists marked A, B, C and D, signed by witnesses who are here this morning. He has also handed in lists marked E, F and G, with Post Office receipts attached thereto, signed by the witness. Mr Saunders, in respect of list A, Mr Stark, in respect of list B, Ms Foster, in respect of list C, Mr Ritchie, in respect of list D, and Mr Walker, in respect of lists E, F and G, do you all prove that, on or before 11 December 2024, as regards to the lists so mentioned, you severally gave notice in writing to the parties mentioned in such lists, in accordance with Standing Orders 22 and 24, that stated the intention to apply for a Bill, whereby it is proposed to alter or repeal any express statutory provision now in force for the protection of the owner or reputed owner, lessee or reputed lessee, or occupier of any specifically designated property, or the protection or benefit of any public trustees or commissioners, corporation or other persons specifically named in such provision? Mr Saunders, do you so prove?

250. **MR PHILIP SAUNDERS:** I do.

251. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Mr Stark, do you so prove?

252. **MR WILLIAM STARK:** I do.

253. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Ms Foster, do you so prove?

254. **MS KATIE FOSTER:** I do.

255. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Mr Ritchie, do you so prove?

256. **MR DANIEL RITCHIE:** I do.

257. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Mr Walker, do you so prove?

258. **MR DAVID WALKER:** I do.

259. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Mr Walker, do you prove that, in the case of notices forwarded by posts and shown in the lists marked E, F and G, such notices were posted before 8 December 2024, and none of such letters were returned by the Post Office as undelivered?

260. **MR DAVID WALKER:** Yes.

261. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** I prove that the lists marked, respectively, A, B, C, D, E, F and G together contain the names of all the persons for the time being entitled to enforce any express statutory provision now in force for the protection of the owner or reputed owner, lessee or reputed lessee, or occupier of any specifically designated property and the protection or benefit of any public trustees or commissioners, corporation or other person specifically named in such provision that is proposed to be altered or repealed, except those persons whose identity could not, after reasonable inquiry, be ascertained. I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

262. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you. I will ask the question that you are probably anticipating: are or were there any persons whose identity you could not ascertain?

263. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** No. There were two provisions in relation to Billingsgate, which are, effectively, spent. One of those is in relation to people who were appointed to the officer of deputy Oyster meters. No such officer has been appointed since, I believe, the 1860s, and it was the Corporation of London that appointed those people in any event, so there was nobody left who could enforce it.

264. Another provision was for the protection of Hungerford market, related to the ability of Hungerford market to bring fish into that market. That market, I believe, was very badly damaged by fire in the 1850s and was completely abolished in the 1860s. The market is no longer there—it is where Charing Cross railway station now is—and, in any event, related to Billingsgate market, which is no longer on the site it was at that time.

265. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** That is a very full answer. Thank you very much. For clarity, you have cited both paragraphs A and B as the protections, and your Bill impacts both A and B.

266. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** I need to check the provisions. I think it may be that it is just B, but I need to double check. Yes, for these purposes it is just B.

267. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you very much. I think my colleague has a question.

268. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you. On the lists that you provided to us this morning, the list that was signed by Katie Foster says that notice was given to Mr Daniel Ritchie. Is that the same Daniel Ritchie?

269. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** It is Mr Ritchie, who is here. Mr Ritchie is an assistant director in the city surveyors department in the City of London Corporation. He works in the markets directorate, and he is, therefore, a member of the Billingsgate Market advisory committee, and so needed to be served in that capacity.

270. **MR JUSTIN LESLIE:** Thank you.

271. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you.

272. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** In relation to Standing Order 19A, I prove that this Standing Order is not applicable to the Bill.

273. I prove that Standing Order 19B is not applicable to the Bill.

274. I prove that Standing Order 20 is not applicable to the Bill, and that Standing Orders 21 and 25 are not applicable. For the record, I do not believe that compliance needs to be proved in respect of Standing Orders 22, 23 and 24.

275. I prove that Standing Order 25A is not applicable to the Bill, because it is not promoted by the Greater London Authority, Transport for London, the London Development Agency or the council of a London borough.

276. For the record, I do not believe compliance with Standing Order 26 requires to be proved separately.

277. I prove that Standing Orders 27 to 37 are not applicable to the Bill.

278. Mr Walker, do you prove that, on 27 November, you deposited, in accordance with Standing Order 26, Standing Order 201 of the House of Lords, and Standing Order 209 of the House of Commons, a printed copy of the Bill in the Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments, in the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons, and in the Vote Office?

279. **MR DAVID WALKER:** I do.

280. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** I prove that there is attached to every copy of the Bill a printed memorandum describing the Bill generally and, subject to Standing Order 38(4), every clause in the Bill, and including a statement of opinion by or on behalf of the promoters as to the compatibility of the provisions of the Bill with the convention rights as defined in the Human Rights Act 1998. Therefore, I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

281. Mr Walker has handed in the list of government departments that were, again, all served electronically, with the email receipts thereto. Mr Walker, do you prove that, on or before 4 December 2024, you deposited, as specified in the appropriate list

kept under Standing Order 1A and in accordance with Standing Order 26, copies of the Bill?

282. **MR DAVID WALKER:** I do.

283. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** I prove that those deposits are the only deposits required to be made under Standing Order 39, and I consider that this Standing Order has been complied with.

284. Standing Order 40 was repealed in the 1980s.

285. In respect of Standing Order 41, I prove it is not applicable to the Bill.

286. I prove that Standing Orders 42 and 43 are not applicable.

287. I prove that Standing Order 44 is not applicable.

288. Standing Order 46 was repealed in 1990.

289. In respect of Standing Orders 45 and 47 to 59, I prove that those Standing Orders are not applicable to the Bill.

290. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** Thank you very much. Do my colleagues have any questions? No. Thank you. Many thanks, Mr Wright. We find that the Standing Orders applicable to the Bill have been complied with.

291. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Thank you very much.

292. **MS CHRISTINE SALMON PERCIVAL:** That concludes our examination for this year. All I can do is wish you a happy Christmas.

293. **MR PAUL WRIGHT:** Thank you, and indeed to you. Happy Christmas.
The committee adjourned at 12.40 pm.