



# THE REPORT

CITY OF WESTMINSTER AND HOLBORN LAW SOCIETY NEWS

NO.60 NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 2008

## THE PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

ADRIAN BARHAM

Taking over as President of the Society in such turbulent financial times is not without a fair degree of trepidation. I know from many people I have spoken to recently that the economic downturn is having a severe impact on the running of their firms and, inevitably, there will be a need to let staff go. All is not well out there.

At times like these, membership of your local law society can seem like an unnecessary expense – indeed, I have had that argument put to me by more than one person. But the support and guidance that can be provided through membership of the Society is invaluable. Your Committee has amongst its members with considerable expertise in a wide range of areas, all of whom work to ease your professional burdens. Our technical committees lobby government to reduce the legislative hurdles, and there is always the social aspect to give you a chance to air your concerns and realise that you are not alone.

But however difficult we think we have it here at the moment, we should all spare a thought for the lawyers in Colombia whose defence of their clients' basic human rights puts them at very real risk of kidnap and murder on a daily basis. With the very generous financial support of the Law Society Charity, a delegation from your Society went to Colombia recently to shine a light on the difficulties experienced by our colleagues in that jurisdiction. The second part of our report into that trip is in this edition of The Report. We are also holding a lecture on international human rights, with special reference to the Colombian situation, on 8 December. I do hope as many of you as possible will come along to hear what your Society is doing to help.

Those of you who were able to join us at our Annual General Meeting on 14 October will have heard me set out my hopes for the future of the Society, and in particular my hope to increase the level of communication we have with

you, our Members. We already have the very successful Report, but we are looking to add to that in the New Year with a regular e-mail newsletter with key information from your Society. If you haven't already provided your e-mail address to our Administrator, please do so now so that you don't miss out (simply send an e-mail to [admin@cwls.org.uk](mailto:admin@cwls.org.uk)).

Communication, though, is a two way thing. And as important as us communicating with you is the need for you to communicate with us. We very much value your views about what we should be doing for you and, particularly in the current climate, what we can do to help your business. We already run a series of very low cost CPD lectures so that the cost of meeting your professional obligation can be kept as low as possible. But what else can we reasonably do to help you? Please do let us know.

One of the pleasures of being President of your Society is the fact that, along with the Chairman of the City of London Law Society, you get to present the Wig & Pen Prize to the young solicitor who has made the best contribution to the provision of pro bono legal advice during the year. At the Junior Lawyers Division's Pro Bono Awards on 13 November I was able to present the silver quill and ink stand to Gulley Shimeld from city firm Lovells, who has provided over 300 hours of support to ParalympicsGB during the past year – including being on site at the Paralympic Games in Beijing. Dedication like this from a younger member of the profession is an inspiration to us all. Imagine what could be achieved if all 10,000 of the solicitors living or working in Westminster and Holborn provided just 1 hour of their time on a pro bono basis.

You may have read in the legal press that the representative part of the Law Society has initiated a review into the way the profession is regulated, which will be conducted by Lord Hunt. This has been reported as the City looking for a



light touch regulation, possibly at the expense of the rest of the profession. This could not be further from the truth. The review provides us all with an opportunity to say what we like or don't like about the way in which the profession is regulated, which may or may not lead to change. Your Professional Matters Sub-Committee will be looking at this issue and responding on behalf of your Society. Do please let us have your views so that they can be reflected in our submission.

All that remains for me to do is to wish you the very best for the festive season, and a more prosperous New Year.

## DIARY

2008

DECEMBER

8 Lecture: International Human Rights Law

2009

JANUARY

21 Committee meeting  
26 CWLS lecture  
27 Welcome Drinks

FEBRUARY

Mary Ward lecture  
25 Committee meeting

MARCH

3 Annual Dinner  
25 Committee meeting  
30 CWLS Lecture

# CONTENTS

## The City of Westminster and Holborn Law Society

A company limited by guarantee  
registered in England and Wales  
number 5467334

Registered office:  
25 Rotherwick Road  
London NW11 7DG  
Telephone/Fax: 020 8209 1039  
www.cwhls.org.uk

### Editor

Rosemary Lester  
6 Westhorpe Road  
Putney  
London SW15 1QH

### Editorial Board

Timothy Drabble  
Andrew Hill  
Adrian Barham  
Elizabeth Beesley

### Published by

The City of Westminster and  
Holborn Law Society

### Printed by

Hunts Printing  
12A Station Field Industrial  
Estate, Kidlington  
Oxford OX5 1JD  
Telephone 01865 853633  
print@hunts.co.uk  
www.hunts.co.uk

All rights reserved, reproduction  
in whole or part without written  
permission from the Publisher is  
not permitted. Photographic  
material and manuscripts are  
supplied at owners risk, neither  
the company nor its agents accept  
any liability for loss or damage.

The views expressed in The  
Report are not necessarily those  
of the Society, Editor or Editorial  
Board. No responsibility is  
accepted for any advertisement or  
advertising material inserted in  
The Report.

  
**Help & Support**  
SOLICITORS SUPPORT NETWORK

**0800 328 4203**

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN	1
GAMLEN PRIZE	3
LAW SOCIETY EXCELLENCE AWARD	3
FBE	3
COMMONWEALTH LAW CONFERENCE	4
MEETINGS ABOUT COLOMBIA	5
COLOMBIAN REPORT	6
NIGEL MAYHEW LECTURE	8
COUNCIL MEMBER'S REPORT	10
COMMITTEE LIST	11
DIRECTORS' REPORT	11
CWHS LECTURES	12
JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS	12
ANNUAL DINNER	12

The deadline for all copy for the January edition of THE REPORT  
is **9 January 2009**

Copy to be sent to The Editor – [rl Lester@lesting.fsnet.co.uk](mailto:rl Lester@lesting.fsnet.co.uk)  
Previous copies of The Report are available on the Society's website:  
[www.cwhls.org.uk](http://www.cwhls.org.uk)

### SUBSCRIPTIONS

All members will have received their Subscription Requests for the year which commenced immediately after the Annual General Meeting on 14 October, either direct or addressed to their firm's contact. This is a plea to members to pay their Subscriptions without delay or to urge their Chief Cashiers, Managing Partners or Senior Partners (as appropriate) to make the necessary arrangements. Much too much of the Administrator's time is taken up chasing the "stragglers". Please send in your subs well before the Christmas rush becomes a poor excuse; preferably well before. Many thanks to those who have already paid in good time.

### Tax Deductibility of Subscriptions paid to The City of Westminster and Holborn Law Society

While sending out this note this is a reminder to members in salaried posts that they are able to deduct the amount of their subscriptions to the Society to arrive at their taxable income. The Society is approved under Section 344 of the Income Tax (Earnings and Pensions) Act 2003. The reference which should be quoted is 951/C1314WW.  
Timothy Drabble (Honorary Treasurer)

**President:** Adrian Barham, Department of Health, Room 523C, New Court, 48 Carey Street WC2A 2LS  
020 7412 1213 [adrian.barham@dwp.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:adrian.barham@dwp.gsi.gov.uk)

**Senior Vice President:** Peter G Adams, 5 Osten Mews, Emperors Gate, London SW7 4HW  
07768 435575 [Adamspg@gmail.com](mailto:Adamspg@gmail.com)

**Junior Vice President:** Margaret Heathcote, Farrer & Co LLP, 66 Lincoln's Inns Fields, London WC2A 3LH  
020 7242 2022 [smh@farrer.co.uk](mailto:smh@farrer.co.uk)

**Honorary Treasurer:** Timothy H Drabble, Okehurst, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9HS  
01403 782 535 [drabtim@okehurst.co.uk](mailto:drabtim@okehurst.co.uk)

**Honorary Secretary:** Matthew J Claxson, Fentons Solicitors LLP, 19 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NS  
020 7291 6577 [matthew.claxson@fentons.co.uk](mailto:matthew.claxson@fentons.co.uk)

**Deputy Honorary Secretary:** Jonathan P Cornthwaite, Wedlake Bell, 52 Bedford Row, London WC1R 4LR  
020 7395 3122 [jcornthwaite@wedlakebell.com](mailto:jcornthwaite@wedlakebell.com)

**Editor:** Rosemary Lester, 6 Westhorpe Road, Putney, SW15 1QH  
020 8788 7023 [rl Ester@lesting.fsnet.co.uk](mailto:rl Ester@lesting.fsnet.co.uk)

**Administrator:** Elizabeth Beesley, 25 Rotherwick Road, NW11 7DG  
020 8209 1039 [admin@cwhls.org.uk](mailto:admin@cwhls.org.uk)

## THE GAMLEN LAW PRIZE 2008

This year the Society awarded the Gamlen Law Prize to Amy Bell-Wilson, who is a trainee with Farrers. The runner up was Toby Richards-Carpenter, who is a trainee at Bircham Dyson Bell. This Prize is awarded to the most promising student on the Legal Practice Course within the area of the City of Westminster and Holborn. Each course provider nominates a suitable candidate for consideration by the Society for award of the Prize.

The Prize was presented at the Society's AGM by Rodney Stubblefield, one of the Gamlen Trustees. The Prize was established in memory of the Gamlen Family and more especially St. John Gamlen, who was the last of five generations of Solicitors, and was a meticulous and sparing draftsman. In nominating a candidate, the course provider must, *inter alia*, have regard to the candidate's ability to reduce a complicated subject into simple and lucid language, able to be understood by a lay client.



## LAW SOCIETY EXCELLENCE AWARDS

Katherine Craig, a newly qualified solicitor at Christian Khan, was highly commended in the Excellence Awards on 23 October. She was runner-up in the Junior Lawyer category. The judges stated that Kat's "energy, dedication and commitment have had a huge impact, and she will go on to make an even bigger impact in the future". Kat is known for her energetic campaigning for legal aid, and as a prominent member of Young Legal Aid Lawyers she has been

active in the Law Society's "What Price Justice?" and Defend Legal Aid Campaigns. Kat was described as showing "an unwavering commitment to legal aid work and...tireless energy to fight for her clients...one of the great lawyers of her generation" Kat is a member of CWHLS Access to Justice Committee, and was a member of the human rights international "Caravana" of lawyers who went to Colombia in August.



## FEDERATION OF EUROPEAN BARS IN TORQUAY 16 TO 18 OCTOBER 2008 - AUTUMN CONGRESS

There have been some very interesting locations for the FBE conferences over the last few years, but UK delegates were not anticipating such from Torquay. How wrong we were! Delegates were treated to some of the historical and cultural treats of the area, the most important being the 350,000 year old caves at Kent's Cavern, where delegates were delighted at the archaeological finds of early human existence. A medieval great barn which has been faithfully restored rang to the songs of Gilbert & Sullivan, and the Royal Naval College Officer Training school at Dartmouth capped the congress with its historical building and wonderful view of the sheltered estuary and bay.

However, these sights were not the reason we had come to Torquay. FBE is a combination of training in specific subjects, sharing information between the Bars of different European countries, and a forum for policy discussion about matters affecting the legal profession. Day one of congress saw an excellent debate on the core duties of the profession. Andrew

Holroyd (Immediate Past President of the Law Society) launched the proceedings with an overview of the profession and the interaction between ethical commitment and the rules and regulations. Sara Chandler spoke on the core values, and the Codes of Conduct of the Bar and the Law Society. Contributions from Germany, Italy, Romania, Czech Republic and Spain followed, all interspersed with lively debate led by the Congress Chair for the day. Professor Kim Economides of Exeter University spoke on the ethical values of the profession and his recent study for the Law Society on ethics. At the end of day one, Dora Lucy Arias, a Colombian lawyer, and recent Chair of ACADEUM, the organisation which welcomed the CWHLS delegation to Colombia in August, gave a moving address to Congress on defending the right to defend in Colombia.

Day two commenced bright and early with David Morgan in the chair for a session on Alternative Business Structures, and the impact of the Legal Service Act. Andrew Holroyd set the ball rolling with an

exposition of the Act which led to heated debate during the day's session as our colleagues from European jurisdictions expressed their concern and even dismay at the changes to the structure of the profession in England and Wales. They are adamantly opposed to multi disciplinary arrangements of any kind, and value the independence of the legal profession very highly. They see the impact of the Legal Services Act as an attack upon the independence of the profession.

On Saturday morning the FBE commissions met. These are standing working parties which carry out the work of the FBE. Anyone who is interested should approach David Morgan, Sara Chandler or Jeffrey Forrest for information about how they can get involved. CWHLS is a member of several commissions, and has been active in the Human Rights commission for some years; hence the invitation to Colombian lawyers, who have spoken at every Autumn Congress for the last three years.

# COMMONWEALTH LAW CONFERENCE IN JAMAICA:

16 - 19 OCTOBER 2008

JEFFREY FORREST



*This is a shortened version of Jeffrey Forrest's address to the Conference*

This year I was delighted to attend an LSE reunion (although a little less pleased to realise that, as a member of the glorious revolutionary class of 1968, this was our fortieth anniversary). The topic for the reunion debate was both prescient and topical – “*A New Global Economic Order for the 21st Century?*” As a non-economist, I was relieved to hear that my inability to understand the complexities of modern financial markets was not wholly due to my lack of intelligence: it transpired that the so-called experts also had no understanding of the toxic junk that was being bundled up and tossed around.

A distinguished speaker suggested that a positive consequence of the crisis might be to wake us from what John Stuart Mill called “*the deep slumber of a decided opinion*”. Mill was talking about the South Sea Bubble of 1720. Now, the events that have been unravelling on financial markets since summer 2007 are of great significance, not only because they may - or may not - be a turning point but because they make us stop and ask where we are and how we got here.

In the UK in the last 30 years, governments employed the old alchemists' trick of turning base metal into gold, by turning assets into revenue: the wholesale “privatisation” of state owned industries and businesses and PFI (Private Finance Initiative) schemes to produce infrastructure at apparently little or no public cost, both of which have provided massive financial rewards for the retained bankers and lawyers. These remarks are relevant to our topic – the Legal Profession in a Shrinking World – because we see the same ideas being applied to the law, treating the law as a commodity, where vigorous competition should be encouraged in the belief that it will always be in the public interest.

To consider the challenges facing the profession, we need to define “the legal profession”. In England, when I qualified as a solicitor in the 1970s, the “legal profession” meant something less than 30,000 solicitors and about 3,600 barristers, plus the judiciary. Last year, over 108,000 solicitors held practising certificates, and there were over 12,000 self employed barristers; plus those who are often the backbone of the profession, legal executives and non qualified support staff, paralegals. We must ask: Are there too many lawyers, particularly if we are about to enter a new economic order? One of the challenges we face is, is there or will there be enough work for us all, not to mention the huge numbers incurring much personal expense to study and qualify?

Next, “profession”. A profession is a discipline requiring study and learning, having definable standards of performance and conduct. It is generally held that one of the hallmarks of a profession is self-regulation. In England, there have been significant legislative changes in the legal profession recently. One battle we fought hard and, I think, won, was to preserve the independence of the profession against an interventionist government.

At the Commonwealth Law Conference in Nairobi last year, I thought that some delegates clearly saw a threat of foreign firms setting up in (say) India, taking away work that could perfectly well be done by local lawyers. I recall a Kenyan lawyer complaining similarly, of clients bringing in the big guns from London to work on a complex deal, distrusting the quality of the local talent. If globalisation means big English firms setting up in Commonwealth countries, doing the work otherwise done by local lawyers, is that a threat to local lawyers? On that basis, yes, but arguably the more likely scenario is of joint ventures which actually

create work for local lawyers and enhance the provision of high quality local legal services.

The legal profession is a broad church. In England, it includes under-resourced legal aid lawyers undertaking poorly paid public work, High Street solicitors doing bread and butter work, lower and higher court advocates, as well as the Mega City firms. They may have very little indeed in common in terms of work and rewards but, happily, they continue to see themselves as a single profession with common ideals and ethics.

There has been a huge increase in numbers while I have been in the profession, and massive technological changes. Our work patterns as lawyers have changed completely. A big English law firm can have its “back office” anywhere in the world – as can a smaller firm. The traditional High Street firm did a little bit of everything, typically with a core of property conveyancing. Many of these activities lend themselves to being commoditised and undertaken in volume. A significant few law firms have taken on this kind of work and even before the drastic downturn in the property market this year, traditional High Street firms have been feeling the pinch. That will accelerate, and I have no doubt that through a combination of less work and higher costs, many firms will amalgamate and many will go out of business. Similarly, some small firms or individuals have seized internet possibilities, to provide online legal services such as will writing, the provision of contract forms and even court forms for divorce or bankruptcy. As internet retailers have found, one can operate profitably from a distant warehouse without the need for fancy offices. I do not suggest that we will ever have a profession where face to face client contact is entirely unnecessary, but a large part of our work does not involve that contact, as

some lawyers have discovered to their profit and others are only starting to discover, to their cost. If I don't need to be in Westminster, why just move my operation to, say, Kingston upon Thames? Why not Kingston, Jamaica?

What I am saying was already being said ten years ago, but things are accelerating and High Street solicitors are now being hit: much of their traditional work is going to the bigger players or is uneconomical. Certainly this has happened to what remains of publicly funded legal aid work, and in current economic circumstances much of the remaining work has dried up.

In 2001, David McIntosh, then President of the Law Society, divided demand for legal services into three categories - "rocket science" work, work of importance to the client and routine tasks:

*"I believe the future for us lies only with work where we can add the extra value which solicitors uniquely bring. This means we need to major on the first and second categories of work".*

As to the City firms, I cannot say whether, if there is to be a new economic order, they will have enough work to keep their highly paid and highly specialised lawyers busy. Hitherto we in a different legal world would remark ruefully how the big firms could move seamlessly from M & A work into insolvency and corporate recovery. Many City lawyers

have very specialised expertise in PFI work, financial instruments and bonds etc. It remains to be seen whether these skills may be redundant.

Soon after Sir David Clementi's Report in December 2004, the government accepted his recommendations; the 2005 White Paper led to the Legal Services Bill, which became the Legal Services Act 2007. In anticipation of the Report and subsequent legislation, the profession, solicitors and bar, separated their representative and regulatory functions in ways that comply with his recommendation and the legislation.

The Legal Services Act has established a new authority overseeing the entire profession, the Legal Services Board. The Law Society is the "Approved Regulator", responsible to the LSB, but the new independent regulator is the Solicitors Regulation Authority, funded by and answerable to the Law Society but acting independently in the public interest. The inevitable tensions between the Law Society and the SRA are already showing.

The legislation went further than the recommendations by introducing Alternative Business Structures. The machinery is being put in place and will further the commoditisation trend. Banks, insurers and motoring organisations will be aiming to set up one stop law shops, offering conveyancing, probate and other legal

services. This must put yet more pressure on the long term survival of smaller law practices unable to achieve economies of scale.

I mention another significant anniversary. Sixty years ago a ship arrived from Jamaica, bringing the first wave of young British citizens from the Commonwealth, seeking a new life in Britain. I don't know if the images of the Empire Windrush are as iconic in the West Indies as in the UK, marking as they do the start of the change of Britain into a diverse multi racial society - not always easy. In the legal profession, there are no bars on entry based on merit but it can be extremely difficult to secure a training contract or pupillage. We still have some way to go before black and minority ethnic lawyers are sufficiently represented in the higher echelons of the profession and in the judiciary, and the pressure on getting established means that many minority ethnic young lawyers set up their own small practices - just the kind of small firms now feeling the effects of the changes to the profession. One cannot say that there are rosy prospects for all current or aspiring members of the profession. We face major changes and many pressures. We must try to understand what is happening, if we are to adapt and survive.

And we need to wake from the deep slumber of our decided opinions.

## MEETINGS ABOUT COLOMBIA

### REPORT ON MEETINGS 13 AND 14 OCTOBER 2008

Members of the CWHS delegation to Colombia met with two Colombian human rights lawyers in meetings. The first meeting was held at the Law Society on 13 October, when a brief report back was given by Courtenay Barklem (Law Society Human Rights Policy Advisor) Ole Hansen and Sara Chandler to a

meeting attended by CWHS "caravanistas" and around 70 lawyers. The meeting was addressed by Dora Lucy Arias who gave an update on the current situation and called for international support for the defence of the right to defend, and for support for human rights defenders at risk. The following evening

on 14 October, a packed meeting in a House of Commons Committee Room heard Dora Lucy Arias, Sara Chandler and Tony Lloyd MP call for support for human rights defenders, and an outline of the findings of the lawyers' human rights delegation in which CWHS members took part in August 2008.

# COLOMBIA PART TWO

BY NEENA ACHARYA, ELLEN JAMES, PIP SALVADOR-JONES AND KAT CRAIG

MEMBERS OF THE CWHLS DELEGATION FUNDED BY THE LAW SOCIETY CHARITY.

**Neena Acharya writes:** I was part of the delegation that went to Bucaramanga in the district of Santander, which lies to the north of Bogota, and towards the border with Venezuela. We arrived in Bucaramanga on a beautiful tropical morning and a briefing with Maria Cordona Mejia, the Executive Director of the Permanent Committee for the Defence of Human Rights who had organised the Bucaramanga part of the Caravana. We were accompanied by Eduardo Careno, one of the founders of the Corporacion Colectivo Abogados Jose Alvear Restrepo.

Our first meeting was at the office of the Governor of Santander. We had been expecting to meet the Governor himself, newly elected and a liberal with a stated interest in human rights. However, on reaching the Governor's offices, it transpired that not only was the Governor unavailable (we later learned he was in hospital with Dengue Fever) but that his Secretary and the Coordinator of the Office of Peace and Human Rights were also away. Instead we had a frustrating meeting with the Secretary's secretary who was not authorised to answer many of our questions.

In the afternoon we met lawyers working to defend workers' rights, and the rights of internally displaced persons (IDPs), mainly campesinos (peasant farmers) and indigenous peoples. They described the difficulties faced by lawyers working with these groups – threats which were not investigated by the police and which had led to some lawyers being forced into exile, spurious legal charges being brought against lawyers winning cases for the rights of workers.

The following day we met with the President of the regional branch of the CUT (Trades Union Congress) and other trade unionists and were given statistics describing the treatment suffered by trade union leaders and also low level members (threats, disappearances and murders). Many of them had lost their jobs as a result of union activity and had been unable to find employment since.

That afternoon we took very moving testimony from victims of human rights abuses and NGOs representing, for



example, the rights of IDPs. The room was packed with people who had travelled many miles to see us, many of them bringing documentary evidence about the crimes they were reporting. They waited patiently but it was impossible to hear everyone in the time available. The weight of expectation in the room was overwhelming – the expectation being that we as foreign observers might somehow be able to help them - and we all felt exhausted by the end. However, we were able to have one last meeting that evening with health leaders who told us of the dismantling of the public health service in Colombia, and depressed us totally. (After this I recall that we drank rather a lot of rum and aguardiente.)

I feel very lucky to have been on the Caravana; I met some incredibly courageous and modest people, both human rights defenders (HRDs) and those who have suffered human rights abuses in Colombia. Our work to assist the HRDs has only just begun - I hope that after reading our articles other lawyers are inspired to get involved.

**Ellen James writes:** As part of the delegation to Colombia earlier this year, I was lucky enough to travel to Turbo, a small town on the North West coast of Colombia in the Department of Antioquia. Turbo itself is in the heart of vast banana plantations which are controlled by multi-national companies. Cash crops, such as bananas, are very important to Colombia as a whole and this region in particular, and are deeply entwined with the forced displacement that has been such an issue in this region.

Many communities were displaced from their lands as a result of Operation Genesis, an army operation in the late

90's which involved aerial bombardment of remote communities in an attempt to drive out guerrilla groups. Many of these groups are still displaced 12 or more years later, often despite having gained legal title to their lands following lengthy legal processes. Many of their lands however have since been planted with cash crops such as the African Palm and attempts to retake possession have resulted in further displacement.

Common among many of the communities is the issue that the original lands were ancestral or tribal lands. These are people with a deep connection to their lands who are simply not able to live in any other way. It had been suggested to us by various governmental organisations that communities who had been displaced for long periods of time simply did not want to go back to their lands, having made new urban lives in towns and cities. This was not something that we encountered. The communities we met were living in utter poverty in desolate conditions with very little help from anyone. They encountered discrimination on a daily basis and yet their main concern was the dangers being faced by those people who were trying to help them. Sadly their concerns are very real, as the lawyers helping the communities have repeatedly received death threats and harassment.

**Pip Salvador-Jones:** On 29 August, 8 Caravana members including Peter Burbage, Sara Chandler, Alison Parkinson and myself were hosted by the Law Faculty of Rosario University. Founded 350 years ago and situated in the historic centre of Bogota, Rosario is Colombia's oldest university. Its alumni include every former President of the Republic. We were warmly welcomed by the Dean and the faculty. They explained the law course curriculum and qualification route for Colombian lawyers and the law students gave presentations of their work.

Colombia follows the Spanish model. To qualify, lawyers must follow a 5 year university course, the content of which is decided by the faculty itself. They must then take six examinations: crime, employment, civil, administrative, commercial and constitutional law. To start practising as a lawyer they must

register with the Ministry of Justice and demonstrate either one year of legal practice or one additional year of (post graduate) study. Colombia has no practical training schools; however all law faculties must offer a *Consultorio juridico* clinical legal advice and casework service. In their fourth and fifth years of study, students are required to work a minimum number of hours in the *Consultorio*.

Rosario's *Consultorio* combines a number of different legal practice areas with a conciliation service and a social work unit. Criminal litigation is the largest casework area but students also progress civil, family and employment cases. Conciliation is an objective where possible. There are clear policies and procedures regarding take-up and progression of cases and well structured frameworks for support and supervision.

Administrative law and human rights law are other specialist areas. In 1999 Rosario formed a 'Public Actions Group' which carries out research, raises awareness of constitutional rights and takes public interest group actions. The PAG clinic has helped improve water quality in Wayuú and rubbish collection in Raizales, challenged laws adversely affecting indigenous communities and secured disability adaptations to public transport in Bogotá. A human rights research unit was established in 2003.

The students currently work with rural communities to help alleviate the negative environmental, social and economic impact of an Ecopetrol S.A. crude oil pipeline project from Tocancipa to Castilla's Camp. In parallel with group litigation, students use media, social and political strategies to highlight the effect on eco systems, on crops, community health and 'forced migration' upon families. Ecopetrol S.A. has already agreed to reroute the pipeline away from the 'Villapaz' Civil Nature Reserve but there is much work to do as over 12 towns and 500 families along the 167 Km route are affected.

**Katherine Craig writes:** Our group visited the city of Medellin, capital of the department of Antioquia, where current President Alvaro Uribe started his political career. During his term as governor of Antioquia in 1995-1997,

ultra-conservative paramilitary violence was allowed to thrive which, alongside violence by State agents, continues to be one of the major causes of human rights violations in this region.

Although paramilitary groups are purported to have been fully demobilised after a 'peace and reconciliation' process (the ineffectiveness and injustice of which was unanimously criticised by the victims we met), significant remnants of combatants from these groups are still operating under new names. Almost all the lawyers we visited in Medellin had suffered some form of intimidation from paramilitary groups. We heard graphic accounts of phone calls to family homes threatening young children, incidents of unlawful detention and kidnapping, torture, disappearances and extra-judicial killings. Some of the delegation members in our group experienced first hand threats from paramilitary groups and, driving around the city, our guides could point to countless establishments where members of the paramilitary were known to operate.

The most immediate reason our Colombian colleagues are targeted is because they are associated with their unpopular clients, particularly those facing allegations of rebellion or terrorism (crimes that are equally controversial, ambiguous and politically charged in Colombia as elsewhere in the world). Our experience was that in reality many of those accused of these crimes were in fact simply part of a diverse and growing group of people which opposes the current regime through democratic means and demands basic rights for all members of society. Trade unionists, journalists, students and youth workers were all amongst those who risked lengthy prison sentences for defending human rights.

We were told threats to human rights defenders did not simply emanate from paramilitary groups. On a number of occasions state bodies have made unfounded public allegations of links to (illegal) left-wing guerrilla groups, in the knowledge that such association would render the subject extremely vulnerable to both violence and prosecution. These allegations caused an increase in violence against the lawyers implicated, as was the

case with the Director of Medellin's Citizens' Advice Bureau who had been wrongfully accused of being a member of a guerrilla group. When we asked whether these allegations could be intentional acts by State agents to rid themselves of inconvenient opposition we were simply told that the obvious implications of being associated with such groups is well known to all in Colombia, and were left to draw our own conclusions. But as the week progressed, it became increasingly difficult to exclude state involvement in human rights abuses, especially when we heard numerous accounts from victims of the indifference, and even complicity, of the Colombian Army.

All too often these human rights violations are met with impunity and this issue remains at the core of the country's human rights crisis. We met with members of the judiciary who explained that, despite the obvious risks, there were still prosecutors and judges prepared to do what it takes to see justice done. They were faced however with inadequate resources, and a lack of political will from the government. This perpetual lack of action by the State has given a virtual green light for the abuses to continue.

Whatever common perception may be, this conflict is not rooted in cocaine and kidnappings. The problems faced will not be solved by criminalisation of democratic opposition and social protest. Stigmatising those who represent 'undesirables' in society will only inflame a conflict that has been raging for over 40 years. Only this week the US has withdrawn military funding after the Colombian Army was found to be implicated in the unlawful execution of civilians. Other Governments should follow suit.

**Monday 8 December** at the offices of Nabarro, Lacon House, 84 Theobald's Road WC1X 8RW

CPD lecture on International Human Rights Law plus a report on the Colombia visit plus slide show with Courtenay Barklem, Human Rights Policy Advisor, The Law Society, and Sara Chandler, Associate Professor, The College of Law.

# REACH FOR THE SKY

A LECTURE FOR CWHLS IN MEMORY OF NIGEL MAYHEW - 23 SEPTEMBER 2008  
BY CHRISTOPHER KATKOWSKI Q.C. (LANDMARK CHAMBERS)

It is my honour to deliver this Nigel Mayhew Lecture. As the title implies, I intend to bring you up to date with the latest twists and turns in the battle to win planning consents for tall buildings in central London. A generally accepted definition of a tall building is one which is significantly higher than existing buildings in the vicinity but I have in mind much taller buildings, such as the “Gherkin” (more properly, 30 St. Mary Axe) in the City of London. Just to get our bearings, the Gherkin is some 180 metres (40 office storeys) high and was completed in 2004 (architect – Foster & Partners) fractionally shorter than Tower 42 (formerly the Nat West Tower) completed in 1980 at 183 metres (47 office storeys: Seifert).

As members of this Society will know, Westminster City Council has a long established position of resisting proposals for tall buildings within its area (although more recently with some exceptions, for example at Victoria). What might not be so well known is that the WCC has played a lead role in opposing tall buildings proposals in other authorities’ areas. More of this later. I should begin with some background by way of an introduction to the subject matter.

I will concentrate on the scene in London, where most (but by no means all) of the headline cases have been fought in recent years. Planning proposals are determined by local planning authorities unless the developer appeals to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Hazel Blears) against a refusal of, or failure to determine, his scheme, or – as has often been the case with tall buildings proposals – where the local planning authority favours the scheme but the Secretary of State steps in and takes the decision out of the authority’s hands for her own determination. This route to the Secretary of State is known as a “call-in” and invariably means that a public inquiry, presided over by an inspector who reports to the Secretary of State, will be held.

Given the generally controversial nature of tall buildings proposals it is interesting to note that the scheme that blazed the trail in our era for such schemes, the “Gherkin”, was permitted by the City of London Corporation without the intervention of the Secretary of State. (There was great concern at the time that a call-in with all its attendant delay and uncertainty would scupper the investment of Swiss Re in the scheme.) The Corporation has in the main supported tall buildings proposals as a means of seeking to fight back against the towers of Canary Wharf. A recent example of just how realistic this fear is can be seen in the loss of JP Morgan from a site at St. Alphage House near the Barbican to Riverside South in Canary Wharf. Schemes have tended to be called in by the Secretary of State at the suggestion of English Heritage, which is charged with protecting the setting of heritage assets such as listed buildings and conservation areas. By their very nature, tall buildings have an effect beyond their immediate environs and English Heritage has often found itself concerned about the impact of proposed tall buildings on the historic environment.

One has to add the Mayor of London to this heady mix. The former Mayor, Ken Livingstone, was a well known champion of high quality tall buildings schemes. The London Plan – which forms the bedrock of planning in London – contains policies which support such schemes, as do various policy documents which supplement it. Mayor Livingstone maintained a close interest

in such schemes and on a number of occasions encouraged developers to increase the height of their proposals. Much of Mayor Livingstone’s last term of office was spent formulating the London Views Management Framework [LVMF] which is a catalogue of views (e.g. of St. Paul’s) which require careful consideration; some of these views are protected by restrictions on the ability to build tall buildings which might affect them. Those who opposed the previous regime argue that the LVMF is nowhere near restrictive enough. Meanwhile, shortly before the fall of Mayor Livingstone, legislation was enacted to give the Mayor significant powers of intervention to direct local authorities how to decide cases.

It is well known that there was no love lost between Mayor Livingstone on the one hand and English Heritage and Westminster City Council on the other. Before I turn to the new alignments which are emerging now that we have a new Mayor, Boris Johnson, I should give you a thumbnail sketch of the showcase battles of the decade so far.

The first of these concerned the Heron Tower on Bishopsgate in the City of London. An excellent book on the subject of tall buildings – “London High” by Herbert Wright – says that: “More even than 30 St. Mary Axe, this was the skyscraper that decided the future of the City’s skyline.” The architect for this tower is Lee Polisano of KPF. It is mainly an office scheme and was originally proposed at a height of some 183 metres, plus a 39 metre spire / mast, comprising some 33 office storeys. At the time it would have been the tallest building in the City by virtue of its spire / mast. The proposals were supported by the City of London Corporation, Mayor Livingstone and by the Government’s advisor on architecture CABE but opposed by English Heritage, largely on the basis of the impact that the scheme would have on the setting of St. Paul’s as seen from Waterloo Bridge where as one walked across the bridge the tower would be seen to move closer and closer to the cathedral. (Westminster City Council also opposed.) The scheme was called-in for a public inquiry at which I was fortunate to be instructed by the developer (Gerald Ronson) together with a, then, junior barrister, Russell Harris. The inquiry was held in 2001 and was hard fought by all the main participants. I have to confess that at the end of the inquiry I felt that the prospects were pretty evenly balanced, so determined had English Heritage been in its opposition. We had fought each other to a standstill. The following year, 2002, in accordance with the recommendation of the inspector who had conducted the inquiry, the Secretary of State (then John Prescott) granted permission. Subsequently, the Corporation has given consent for an increase in the height of the tower to 202 metres (242 metres with its spire / mast), 46 storeys, and construction of the scheme is now under way. I hope to take the developer up on his very generous offer of a pass to access the Sky Bar at the top of the tower!

No sooner had the Heron Tower been decided than a proposal drawn up by Renzo Piano for Irvine Sellar for a mixed use (offices, hotel and apartments) scheme at London Bridge Station – the “Shards of Glass” (more commonly but inaccurately known as “the Shard”) – was called in and a public inquiry was held in 2003. The local planning authority, Southwark, supported the scheme as did Mayor Livingstone but English Heritage opposed largely on the basis of the effect of the scheme, which at 306 metres / 72 storeys would be the tallest building in Western

Europe, on views from within the Tower of London – a World Heritage Site – and upon views of the WHS from outwith, especially from in front of the Royal Mint building. The old team of Katkowski and Harris was reunited (Russell took silk during the course of the inquiry) and there was another battle royal although it has to be said that Renzo was all but impossible to cross-examine! Later on in 2003 the Secretary of State, John Prescott, followed the recommendation of his inspector and granted permission. Demolition is underway on site and I hope to be able to take the developer up on his very generous offer of an access pass to the viewing gallery towards the top of the tower!

The final set piece battle of Mayor Livingstone’s era concerned the “Walkie Talkie” in Fenchurch Street in the City of London. The scheme is for a 177 metre / 45 storeys office tower designed by Rafael Vinoly for Land Sec and was called in for a public inquiry held in 2007. The old protagonists lined up against each other; the developers were represented by Russell Harris Q.C. The City of London and Mayor Livingstone supported the scheme; English Heritage opposed largely on the basis of the effect of the tower on views of St. Paul’s and the Tower of London. In due course, later on in 2007, the Secretary of State (by now, Ruth Kelly) followed her inspector’s recommendation and granted consent.

Depending on one’s personal opinions about such matters, by this stage in the tale one is either delighted or depressed by these seminal decisions! But planning is a restless subject seemingly incapable of standing still for long if at all. Earlier this year English Heritage won a significant inquiry, albeit not involving tall buildings, when the Secretary of State (Hazel Blears) refused permission to demolish the General Market Building at Smithfield and redevelop the site for a mixed retail and office scheme designed by KPF. (On this occasion I was on the losing side.)

Meanwhile Mayor Johnson has been elected with a manifesto and subsequent “direction of travel” planning statements which favour tall buildings but only in “appropriate locations” (Croydon is singled out as an example) and with a greater emphasis on protecting the settings of heritage assets. The new Mayor’s much closer alignment with the views of Westminster City Council is well known and he has announced his intention to reword the relevant policies of the London Plan and to very significantly recast the LVMF. Interesting times are upon us.

The first major battle of the new era came too soon in Mayor Johnson’s term for him to muster his forces, with the inquiry having been held in February and March this year i.e. before the election but with the decision issued on 19 August 2008 some 3 months after the new Mayor took office. The site in question is in Doon Street, on the South Bank in Lambeth, where Lifschutz Davidson Sandilands have designed a 144 metres / 43 residential storeys tower for Coin Street Community Builders. The scheme was called-in having been supported by Lambeth LBC and Mayor Livingstone. The opposition was led by English Heritage and Westminster City Council (with the Royal Parks adding their weight as well). The main grounds of opposition concerned the impact of the tower on views from the Blue Bridge across the Lake in St. James’s Park towards Horse Guards and the Foreign & Commonwealth Office, the argument being that the presence of the tower would fundamentally

damage the composition of the scene from the bridge by upsetting the delicate balance between buildings and nature. Concerns were also raised about the effect of the tower seemingly breaking the roofline in views from the courtyard of Somerset House.

On this occasion – unlike in the Heron Tower, Shards and Walkie Talkie inquiries – the inspector sided with the opponents of the proposal and in a strongly worded report recommended refusal on the basis that the Doon Street Tower would overpower the scene from the Blue Bridge and would harm views of Somerset House to boot. However, in another twist in the tale, the Secretary of State (Hazel Blears) disagreed and explained that as far as she was concerned the inspector's fears were exaggerated. She granted permission for the proposals just a few weeks ago. English Heritage and Westminster City Council have hinted strongly that they intend to challenge the decision in the High Court (the time to do so expires next Tuesday 30 September) and so there might be more to come in the battle of Doon Street.

This brings me to the latest news from the front line – the Blackfriars Road inquiry. This inquiry, which is currently underway (today was its ninth sitting day), concerns proposals for two separate schemes in Southwark. “Number One Blackfriars Road” is a proposal drawn up by Ian Simpson for a 170 metre / 51 storeys hotel and residential tower for Beetham. Ian Simpson is perhaps best known for his towers in Manchester and Birmingham. Russell Harris O.C. is appearing for the developer. The site is the first that one comes to on the western side just as one has crossed Blackfriars Bridge from the City.

Southwark support the scheme along with proposals by Blackfriars Ltd (Circle Plane) who have instructed me, for two towers on the site immediately south of the Beetham proposals, to the south of Stamford Street at Number 20 Blackfriars Road. The site lies between the Mad Hatter Hotel on Stamford Street and the 1950's Christ Church and its Gardens. The scheme architect is Jim Eyre of Wilkinson Eyre, perhaps best known for the remarkable “Blinking Eye” Millennium Bridge in Newcastle / Gateshead and for Stratford Station. (Just in case you are wondering about his experience of towers, his design for what will be the tallest residential tower in the world – until displaced by a yet taller scheme – is rising out of the ground in Guangzhou in China as I address you.) The proposals at Number 20 are for two towers, the taller at 148 metres / 42 storeys would be residential and the smaller tower, at 105 metres / 23 storeys, offices.

There are many interesting aspects to this inquiry, which was convened following the Secretary of State's decision to call in both schemes for her consideration. One feature of the inquiry is that although English Heritage consider that both of the schemes would harm the view from the Blue Bridge in St. James's Park (one of the protected townscape views in the LVMF) it has decided – uniquely in the recent history of such schemes being considered at inquiry – not to appear at the inquiry and has confined itself to making its representations in written form only.

Instead the opposition at the inquiry is being led by Westminster City Council and the Royal Parks who object to both schemes on the basis of their impact on the views from the Blue Bridge and, in

the case of Number 20, WCC objects to the way in which in certain views from Parliament Square (within the Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey WHS) the taller tower will drift across the gap between Portcullis House and Big Ben. (For those of you who are familiar with the view, the Shell Building at Waterloo does just this now although as it is that much nearer to Westminster it forms a higher feature in the view than Number 20 would.)

There are echoes of arguments pressed in previous inquiries in this current battle. On the promoters' side of the debate – and I will try my best to be even-handed in the way in which I summarise the competing arguments – we contend that the views in question should be assessed in a dynamic context, that is to say that the view changes as one walks across the Blue Bridge and as one moves around Parliament Square, and that far from overpowering the scene there is nothing wrong as a matter of principle in seeing the top of tall buildings over 2 km away in the case of the views from St. James's Park (and some 1.7 km in the case of Parliament Square), indeed a number of consented tall buildings will form part of the scene in due course, not least the Doon Street Tower but also, amongst several others, the Pinnacle in the City and the Shards. Even without these, the scene is not one simply comprising heritage and nature as the Shell Building and the London Eye are prominent as well. In the case of Number Twenty's impact on views from Parliament Square, our argument runs that from most of the Square one would not see the proposed residential tower but in any event views out of the Square currently include a host of modern buildings, some tall (such as the Shell Building) which are all part and parcel of the evolving wider setting. It is, we contend, unreasonable to exert control on this basis over buildings which are so far away and which are part of the regeneration of the South Bank and its hinterland.

Westminster City Council and the Royal Parks object to both proposals in terms of their effect on views from the Blue Bridge. Leaving aside the effect of Doon Street (which I will come to in a moment) it is said that Number One would dominate and overpower the scene from more central positions on the bridge, and that Number Twenty would have a similar effect from views towards the northern end of the bridge. (The different effects are due to the different location and heights of the schemes.) The Doon Street Tower would largely obscure Number One and the City Council acknowledges that in the event that the Doon Street scheme is built, the main argument against Number One is undermined. The Royal Parks argue that Number Twenty would spoil the silhouette of the Doon Street Tower. Trying my best to be fair to my opponents, the gist of the case is that the Doon Street decision is regrettable and enough is enough. WCC has issued draft documents which seek to protect a wider range of views. Thus, for example, in the draft “Metropolitan Views” SPD WCC seeks to protect views from the entire length of the Blue Bridge whereas in Mayor Livingstone's LVMF the designated protected viewpoint is from the centre of the bridge.

As for Parliament Square, the City Council argues that as the taller tower at Number 20 drifts across the gap in the view between Portcullis House and Big Ben it would appear to be “attached” to the base of Big Ben and so would spoil one's ability to appreciate the outstanding universal value of Parliament.

In short, the developers' arguments are keenly contested by Westminster City Council and the Royal Parks, and vice versa.

The case does give rise to some interesting issues of approach. The views which the City Council seeks to protect are obtained from within the Council's area and yet the sites in question are a considerable distance away, on the other side of the Thames, in Southwark which is extremely keen to realise the regenerative benefits of these schemes for what is undoubtedly a run down area. The disparity between the wealth of the City of London across Blackfriars Bridge and this north-western corner of Southwark is striking. Does it really fall to Westminster City Council to intervene in and try its level best to stop schemes which Southwark, the local planning authority for the sites, are so in support of? Is this democratic?

This brings me to the role of the Mayor of London. My answer to the questions that I have just posed is that it should fall to the Mayor to protect strategic issues which cut across borough boundaries. Much of the tension in a number of these show trials to date has been caused by Mayor Livingstone acting in a way which Westminster City Council for example regards as failing to protect strategic interests in what it would regard as the appropriate manner. With the new Mayor it may well be the case that developers and authorities like Southwark conclude that the balance has shifted too far in the opposite direction.

The Blackfriars inquiry is the first instance of the new Mayor expressing a different planning judgement to that reached by his predecessor. Mayor Livingstone expressed support for both schemes but last week a letter arrived at the inquiry from Mayor Johnson opposing both schemes and contradicting the key points made by his predecessor. For each London Plan policy that Mayor Livingstone said we complied with, Mayor Johnson argues that we breach the self-same policies. This might well be a taste of things to come especially in cases where Westminster City Council is leading the opposition.

The inquiry is due to close soon (on 2 October) and the decision should be published within the next six months or so. It is eagerly awaited by many for several different reasons. I hope that I have given you some feel for why this decision will be of great interest to a wide range of interested parties and onlookers.

Looking ahead it may well be that English Heritage, Mayor Johnson and Westminster City Council will unite in seeking to have P&O's proposals for the “3 Sisters” (or “3 Ugly Sisters” as dubbed by objectors) at Elizabeth House, York Road near Waterloo Station (Lambeth LBC) called-in for a public inquiry. Views from Parliament Square form the main ground of opposition and if these three forces align a whole new era in tall buildings inquiries will dawn.

It seems to me inevitable that sooner or later, and it may well be fairly soon, an inquiry will be held in which the principles established in the earlier years of this decade are called into question head on by a newly aligned coalition of opposition forces.

The battle to Reach for the Sky will be fought keenly for years to come – I for one look forward to the challenges that lie ahead!

# COUNCIL MEMBER'S REPORT - OCTOBER



SUE NELSON

## Council Member's Report - October

The purpose of this report is to provide some of the spice which the Gazette leaves out of its reports of Council meetings. Avid Council followers may now hope to receive an account of how the October meeting started with the new DVP doing the dance of the seven veils followed by the VP and President's raunchy rumba but sadly none of this came to pass in the Public Session\*. It was, nevertheless, an interesting meeting – as Council meetings go. The first matter of note was that we had our papers in a timely and orderly fashion, rather than in dribs and drabs – or not at all.

### The Night before Council

Council had a Q and A session with David Edmunds, Legal Services Board Chair, and his Chief Operating Officer, Chris Kenny. Edmunds started by waving the Legal Services Act 2007 in the air and asking 'who here has read this?' By the end of the session, it was clear to the assembled group which side of the floor had the most acute understanding of the Act and its omissions. It is the fate of the Society to have had to try to second guess how the gaps in the legislation will be filled by the LSB. It seemed a tough gig for the podium – all Edmunds could account for was what he has done to date (appoint a board and staff members) and express general views about how he proposes to operate; yet he faced questions across a much wider range of topics. Being unable to tie the hands of his own Board, he could do little more than surround his responses with caveats. He did convey the understanding of his Board that uncertainty was good for no-one, so we can expect some relief with early certainty.

This session would have run even better if Council had been told what had already been discussed with David Edmunds and his staff. It is irksome to

be told 'we have been having lots of useful discussions with your Officeholders and senior staff', and to be left to guess to what effect.

### Size really does not matter - much

The perennial horror of debating the size of Council came and went without any decision being made. This time, however, the cause was that we ran out of time, rather than the will to live. Sadly this means the issue will return in November to haunt us further. Ever since a former President, supported by a senior staff member, expressed the view that the Law Society would be better run by a group of 15 or so 'good chaps', we have had to carry the burden of debating how to cull ourselves. It is hard to imagine a better mechanism for presenting Council at its worst. Size is not the issue and I wish we had invested the time instead in considering how we might become more effective, whatever size we happen to be (93).

### Barbarians at the Door

Council debated whether non-solicitors should be able to affiliate themselves to the Law Society. This is another topic which has been in gestation for 3 to 4 years. The debate revolved around whether we had adequate mechanisms in place to ensure that the affiliates did not end up damaging the brand of solicitor. No plans for how the tasks of 'selection and removal' of affiliate status were to be carried out were presented to the Council. No doubt the plans for 'selection and removal' had not been developed ahead of agreeing the idea in principle, but proceeding in this way does have risks attached.

I am a bit picky about taking enabling powers and voted against the proposal. I should have liked to know more about why creation of affiliate status was the way to ensure a captive purchasing community. Ahead of

knowing more about what we propose to sell and what will remain part of the solicitor membership package the debate seemed premature. Once we are taking £200 per affiliate as a subscription fee, it won't be long before they will want a place on our Council and a say in how their fees are set and spent – what will the solicitor members say then?

### Law Society Committees

This debate has emerged from attempts to both streamline the Committee structure and ensure its effectiveness. Refreshingly, it started with an acknowledgment of the problems the Committees faced which were, for the most part, a lack of resources and poor communications. Council members repeatedly expressed the wish that more money be spent on the Committees but no one suggested where compensating cut backs might be made elsewhere in the organisation. The CE, Des Hudson, needs to move quickly now to giving an assurance that every possible efficiency has been considered so we know we are getting value for the money we are currently spending supporting the work of our Committees. Some Committees need to be told to merge (ADR Committee and Civil Litigation, perhaps?), while all the Committees need to address how their valuable work might be given more prominence with the profession. Meanwhile, the 20 (or more) members of Law Society staff in the Communications Directorate need to mobilise their skills to the advantage of the Committees.

### Confidential Session

As usual we debated and squabbled in private about things of enormous importance to the profession. This month, everything treated as confidential seemed appropriately classified and that must be another first.

\*or at all

# COMMITTEE 2008/2009

---

## OFFICERS

President: Adrian Barham  
Senior Vice President: Peter Adams  
Junior Vice President:  
Margaret Heathcote  
Hon Treasurer: Timothy Drabble  
Hon Secretary: Matthew Claxson  
Deputy Hon Secretary:  
Jonathan Cornthwaite  
Editor of The Report: Rosemary Lester

## ELECTED MEMBERS

Arthur Alexander, Julian Aylmer,  
Catherine Barham, Richard Broadbent,  
Bruce Coles, John Davies,  
Charles Fraser, Richard Henschley,  
Ivan Ho, Ellen James,  
Alison Parkinson, Shams Rahman,  
Pip Salvador Jones, Roisin Smith,  
Ursula Taylor, Arthur Weir,  
Patrick Wheeler, Roger Woolfe

## COUNCIL MEMBERS

Peter Adams (City of Westminster)  
Adrian Barham  
(Government Legal Service)  
Sara Chandler (Voluntary Sector)  
Michael Franks (West London)  
Jeffrey Forrest (City of Westminster)  
David Morgan (Holborn)  
Sue Nelson (City of Westminster)  
Fraser Whitehead (Holborn)

## PAST PRESIDENTS

Michael Gillman  
Sara Chandler

---

## THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER AND HOLBORN LAW SOCIETY

A COMPANY LIMITED BY GUARANTEE REGISTERED IN ENGLAND AND WALES  
NUMBER 5467334

### THE DIRECTORS REPORT YEAR ENDED 31ST MAY 2008

---

The directors have pleasure in presenting their report and the unaudited financial statements of the company for the year ended 31st May 2008

#### PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

The principal activity during the year was the management of the affairs of the local law society in the area of its predecessor association known as The City of Westminster and Holborn Law Society.

#### DIRECTORS

The directors who served the company during the year were as follows:

P G Adams	(appointed 1st June 2005)
A A Barham	(appointed 17th October 2006)
S J M Chandler	(appointed 1st June 2005)
J P Cornthwaite	(appointed 1st June 2005)
T H Drabble	(appointed 1st June 2005)
M J Gillman	(appointed 11th October 2005)
R A Lester	(appointed 1st June 2005)
C S J Fraser	(resigned 9th October 2007)

#### DONATIONS

During the year the company made the following contributions:

	2008	2007
	£	£
Charitable	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

#### SMALL COMPANY PROVISIONS

This report has been prepared in accordance with the special provisions for small companies under Part VII of the Companies Act 1985.

Approved by the directors on 24th September 2008

M J Gillman  
Director

Registered office:  
25 Rotherwick Road London NW11 7DG

# CWHLS LECTURES

## INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW with special reference to CWHLS delegation to Colombia

Lecture led by Sara Chandler and Courtenay Barklem

Monday, 8 December 2008

Following the Society's participation in the visit to Colombia in August, Sara Chandler, Associate Professor and Director of Pro Bono, The College of Law and Courtenay Barklem, Policy Advisor on Human Rights at the Law Society will lecture on International Human Rights Law. They will give a brief overview of the sources of international human rights law, the key concepts, states and treaty obligations, the key organisations, enforcement mechanisms, implementation and monitoring. Sara and Courtenay both participated in the "Caravana de Juristas", an international human rights delegation to Colombia at the end of August. In addition other members of the group will give an illustrated debriefing about the situation that they found and the work that they undertook.

This lecture will begin at 6.15 p.m. at the offices of **NABARRO**, Lacon House, 84 Theobald's Road, WC1X 8RW. One hour of CPD is available (ref JC/CWHLS) - please give your roll number when attending. The cost is £22 for members of this Society, £36 for non members and £10 for students and includes a drink from 6.00 pm.

## INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW

Monday, 8 December 2008

Please send me . . . . tickets @ £36 for the above lecture

Please send me . . . . tickets @ £22 for members of CWHLS

Please send me . . . . tickets @ £10 for students

Please return to Mrs E J Beesley, 25 Rotherwick Road, London NW11 7DG DX 33801 Golders Green

I enclose a cheque for £ \_\_\_\_\_ payable to the City of Westminster and Holborn Law Society

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Firm \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ DX \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS

Have you considered a part time Judicial appointment? For information about opportunities, look at the website of the Judicial Appointments Commission at [www.judicialappointments.gov.uk](http://www.judicialappointments.gov.uk).

For details about the Judicial Work Shadowing Scheme, go to [www.judiciary.gov.uk/publications\\_media/general/work\\_shadowing.htm](http://www.judiciary.gov.uk/publications_media/general/work_shadowing.htm), e-mail [workshadowing@judiciary.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:workshadowing@judiciary.gsi.gov.uk),

or write to  
Judicial Work Shadowing Scheme, Directorate of Judicial Offices of England and Wales,  
Royal Courts of Justice, Thomas More Building, 11th Floor, Strand, London WC2A 2LL.  
Tel: 020 7073 1630.

## ANNUAL DINNER

Tuesday, 3 March 2009

The Society is holding its Annual Dinner in Middle Temple Hall on 3 March. We are pleased to announce that the guest speaker will be the Treasury Solicitor, Paul Jenkins.

We expect this yet again to be an outstanding event and hope that the large number of members for whom this is a regular event will support us yet again, and be joined by those who have never attended such a function: you will be made very welcome.

Watch this space for further details!