



GUILDFORD
B O R O U G H

COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY 9 OCTOBER 2018

ORDER PAPER

ORDER PAPER (Pages 1 - 14)

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY 9 OCTOBER 2018

ORDER PAPER

WEBCASTING NOTICE

This meeting will be recorded for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website in accordance with the Council's capacity in performing a task in the public interest and in line with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014.

The whole of the meeting will be recorded, except where there are confidential or exempt items, and the footage will be on the website for six months.

If you have any queries regarding webcasting of meetings, please contact Committee Services.

On behalf of all councillors, I would like to welcome you to this evening's meeting. I should be grateful if you would ensure that your mobile phones and other hand-held devices are switched to silent during the meeting. If the fire alarm sounds during the course of the meeting - we are not expecting it to go off - please leave the Council Chamber immediately and proceed calmly to the assembly point in Millmead on the paved area adjacent to the river as you exit the site.

This Order Paper sets out details of those members of the public who have given advance notice of their wish to ask a question or address the Council in respect of any matter on the agenda or any matter relating to the Council's functions, powers or duties. It also sets out details of any questions submitted by councillors on any matter relating to the Council's functions, powers or duties or any matter which affects the Borough, or any motions and amendments to be proposed by councillors in respect of the business on the agenda.

Unless a member of the public has given notice of their wish to ask a question or address the Council under Item 6 (Public Participation), they will not be permitted to speak. Those who have given notice may address the Council for a maximum of three minutes. Speakers may not engage in any further debate once they have finished their speech.

Councillor Mike Parsons
The Mayor of Guildford

Time limits on speeches at full Council meetings:	
Public speaker:	3 minutes
Response to public speaker:	3 minutes
Questions from councillors:	3 minutes
Response to questions from councillors:	3 minutes
Proposer of a motion:	10 minutes
Seconder of a motion:	5 minutes
Other councillors speaking during the debate on a motion:	5 minutes
Proposer of a motion's right of reply at the end of the debate on the motion:	10 minutes
Proposer of an amendment:	5 minutes
Seconder of an amendment:	5 minutes
Other councillors speaking during the debate on an amendment:	5 minutes
Proposer of a motion's right of reply at the end of the debate on an amendment:	5 minutes
Proposer of an amendment's right of reply at the end of the debate on an amendment:	5 minutes

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

To receive and note any disclosable pecuniary interests from councillors. In accordance with the local Code of Conduct, a councillor is required to disclose at the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI) that they may have in respect of any matter for consideration on this agenda. Any councillor with a DPI must not participate in any discussion or vote regarding that matter and they must also withdraw from the meeting immediately before consideration of the matter.

If that DPI has not been registered, the councillor must notify the Monitoring Officer of the details of the DPI within 28 days of the date of the meeting.

Councillors are further invited to disclose any non-pecuniary interest which may be relevant to any matter on this agenda, in the interests of transparency, and to confirm that it will not affect their objectivity in relation to that matter.

3 MINUTES (Pages 1 – 14 of the Council agenda)

To confirm the minutes of the Meeting held on 24 July 2018, subject to the correction on page 1 to show that the Mayor and Deputy Mayor were Councillors Mike Parsons and Richard Billington respectively, and that the minute number range should be CO19 to CO36 rather than CO20 to CO37.

The version of the minutes to be signed by the Mayor includes the above corrections.

4 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

To receive any communications or announcements from the Mayor.

5 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader to comment on the following matters:

- 1) Executive submission to latest Local Plan Consultation
- 2) Removal of HRA Cap to enable development of social housing

Councillors shall have the opportunity of asking questions of the Leader in respect of these communications.

6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No questions or requests to make statements have been received from the public.

7 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- (a) **Councillor Susan Parker** to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the following question:

“In view of the publication of the housing need statistics by the Office of National Statistics, which indicate a demographic need for Guildford of 301 homes per year, would the Leader of the Council please make arrangements for the Council to review the Local Plan and amend it in order to reflect this new information? It is understood that this may require dialogue with the Inspector, but during the Examination in Public the

publication of this information, and the need for consequential change, was discussed, acknowledged and agreed. Can we therefore act accordingly?"

The Leader of the Council's response is as follows:

"Regarding arriving at a figure for the Borough's Housing need, it is important to distinguish between methods for establishing this need and which of the two is applicable to Guildford's Submitted Local Plan:

1. The first method is based on establishing need under the transitional provisions of the NPPF (or old methodology), which is the basis upon which the Local Plan was submitted and is being examined;
2. The second is based on establishing need according to Government's new standard method for calculating housing need, which does not apply to the submitted Local Plan.

The new household projection figures, released by ONS are of course relevant to consider in both circumstances as they result in a lower demographic starting point for calculating housing need, but would not necessarily feed through to the same housing need figure due to the variance in approaches. It would thus be grossly unfair to claim that the housing need figure that we put forward in our submission Local Plan was wrong, by quoting a different need figure, which relies on a totally different methodology – a methodology that is increasingly being called into question.

You will remember GBC had chosen to progress the plan making use of the transition provisions, i.e. using the old methodology in part because the proposed new methodology was predicting an OAN figure of 752, which was significantly higher than the 654 contained in the submission plan.

The issue being raised now is, given the latest household projections and applying Government's new standard method, Guildford's OAN would fall to 431. Therefore, the argument runs it is beneficial to Guildford to apply the standard method and not the old methodology under the transitional provisions of the NPPF, as this will reduce the need to allocate so much residential development in the green belt.

As ever with OAN, the situation is not straightforward.

First, with regard to the emerging Local Plan, GBC are reviewing the implications of the projections for housing need under the old methodology. In this regard, the inspector has offered 'the Council an opportunity to comment on the latest version of the Household Projections and their implication for OAN. The related population projections were of course discussed in the hearings.' GL Hearn are currently considering the implications of these insofar as they relate to the old methodology however their initial thoughts are that they do not result in a significant change to the figures. Our formal response is expected by 17 October.

Second, and wholly separate from the Inspector's considerations, GBC is seeking to establish greater clarity on the Government's new standard method and the potential for changes to this method and hence the calculation of housing need. There is significant uncertainty around the new figures. A recent statement by the Minister included the following:

"We are having a very rapid look at this rather unexpected result from the ONS. It has caused some very anomalous results. There's some strong growth areas of the country that now have a zero housing need which is patently obviously incorrect....."

We are looking at some data on the increase in the number of people staying at home to see whether that artificial constraint means we should look at the numbers again.....

We are hoping to make a rapid announcement about that because [councils] are doing the maths and saying 'I'm off the hook...'

This is a projection forward of household formation, not a reflection of previous demand which has been thus far unmet."

The Minister has also been quoted as saying that he has "concerns" about the new projections' implications for housing need figures because they "don't recognise pent-up demand".

There is therefore an indication that Government's new standard method will be amended and in such a way to have regard to suppressed household formation. This is highly likely to increase the figure required within Guildford. Whilst this may not increase it to the extent of the previous figure calculated under the standard method (752), it remains unclear whether it will be higher or lower than the figure being considered by the Inspector under the transitional provisions of the NPPF.

It would therefore be premature to halt the progress of the Local Plan until there is clear confirmation that, based on an amended new standard method, the resulting figure is notably lower than that being considered by the Inspector at present. If and when the standard method is confirmed, the Council will be in a position to consider its implications for the emerging plan that is undergoing main modifications consultation. Whatever these implications are, we are convinced that progress with the Local Plan to date and the weight it carries is a critical step in supporting our desire to address the backlog in delivery of the homes we so desperately need in the borough, particularly in the early years following its adoption. This will occur in a sustainable manner, which includes the provision of supporting transport and other vital infrastructure.

Whilst this level of uncertainty exists, we would encourage people to engage in the consultation process on proposed main modifications including our housing requirement. The Inspector will consider all duly made representations and it will be up to him to convene further public hearing sessions, if he considers them necessary".

Councillor Paul Spooner
Leader of the Council

- (b) **Councillor Tony Rooth** to ask the Lead Councillor for Enterprise and Economic Development, Councillor David Bilbé, the question set out below. The Lead Councillor's comments in response to each element of the question is set out in *red* type below:

"May I ask the Lead Councillor for Enterprise and Economic Development, as a follow-up to the question I asked him at the Council meeting on 10 April 2018, for an update on the following matters in relation to the Village project:

- (i) details of the sale/disposal and removal of the containers,
They were sold to Bootle Containers Ltd for £134,400 plus VAT, and subsequently removed on 15/16 May 2018.
- (ii) clarification of any ongoing business rates liability,
All liability ceased on 16 May 2018

(iii) final costs associated with the disconnection, capping of services, £15,728 including all clearance costs. Original budgeted estimate was £50,000.

(iv) details of supplementary estimates approved,
On 28 November 2017, the Executive approved the following:

- A reduction in the 2017-18 income budget of £376,280 by viring the budget from external interest.
- An increase in the Village expenditure budget for 2017-18 of £254,762 to cover the projected Village costs for 2017-18 by viring the budget from the Minimum Revenue Provision budget.

(v) whether any further consideration had been given to possible temporary uses of the site rather than it just standing empty as a town centre wasteland, for example, temporary parking for public service vehicles (such as Police vehicles), residents' parking and additional visitor parking over the forthcoming Christmas and New Year periods, or temporary use for homeless or other disadvantaged people, Parking was considered, but costs of making the land good for this purpose and installation of associated technology were too high; site owners would also have needed to agree a change of use from the intended retail village.

(vi) whether the Council continues to pay any rent or expenses to the site owners and, if so, how much, together with details of other ongoing expenditure?
No rent paid now or at any stage: the site was made available free of charge by its owners.

(c) **Councillor Bob McShee** to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the following question:

“Please could the Leader report on our partnership with Dongying and why you chose to partner Guildford with an industrial city based on the second largest Chinese oilfield and one of the world’s lead producers of rubber tyres?”

The Leader’s response is as follows:

“I would refer Councillor McShee to the report to the meeting of the Council on 10 October 2017 which approved the signing of the partnership agreement with Dongying. This emphasised the potential benefits of partnerships between British and Chinese towns and cities in terms of trade, investment and through the exchange of knowledge and ideas. Existing links developed by the University of Surrey gave us a particular opportunity to develop a relationship with Dongying.

Building on the visit to Dongying and Beijing, we are exploring how we can deliver economic benefits from the relationship and capitalise on contacts made to identify opportunities for both inward investment and export that would benefit not only the local economy, but also the wider economic area. Discussions will include the possible establishment of a trade office in Guildford. Sectors of focus would include oil and gas (where both historically and currently Guildford and Woking still have a number of companies operating in international markets), agricultural technologies and creative industries including gaming - China being one of the most important markets for the sale of video games in the world.

The University of Surrey has recently demonstrated the value of cooperation with its Chinese counterparts by winning the prestigious “Visual Object Tracking” competition in partnership with Jiangnan University. The algorithm that they developed to track objects in video was described as one of the most advanced in the world and is an important feature of many AI applications, such as visual surveillance, autonomous navigation and

robotics. It is important that we continue to support the University of Surrey in forging new relationships that continue to place Guildford at the forefront of ground-breaking technological innovation”.

Councillor Paul Spooner
Leader of the Council

- (d) **Councillor Tony Rooth** to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the question set out below. The Leader’s comments in response to each element of the question is set out in *red* type below:

"In view of a revised forecast for Guildford borough's population growth, issued by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) in September 2018, which contains a substantial projected reduction in housing need target to 431, does the Leader of the Council consider:

- (a) that the submission Local Plan will require change, potentially major modification and amendment followed by further public consultation, if the final housing need figure is substantially below the figure used in the modified Local Plan currently out for public consultation;
This is answered in the response to Councillor Parker’s question above.
- (b) whether it would be in Guildford's interest to adopt the standard method used in the latest ONS figures as the base for calculating housing need;
This is also answered in the response to Councillor Parker's question. However, Guildford’s interest is in adopting a Local Plan that meets our housing need, in the most sustainable way, which includes the delivery of necessary supporting infrastructure, and with a focus on affordable homes. Alongside this, we must achieve an appropriate balance between housing, employment and retail needs, whilst protecting the heritage and character of our borough. The actions that are outlined above will help to inform how best to achieve these aims.
- (c) that, pending resolution of the figure for Guildford's housing need, the existing main modifications, specifically MM 39, policy A61 - the potential development of 200 homes at Aaron's Hill, Godalming should be withdrawn from the Submission Local Plan?
Due to the consultation being in progress, it is not possible to comment further around any potential modifications to the Local Plan. Further modifications in order to make the plan sound would be recommended by the Inspector. Nevertheless, clearly this question cannot be answered in the absence of answers to the first two questions, the responses to which have already been outlined.
- (e) **Councillor Nils Christiansen** to ask the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance, Councillor Matt Furniss, the question set out below. The Lead Councillor’s comments in response to each element of the question is set out in *red* type below:

It states in the 22 May 2018 report to the Executive on the Walnut Bridge Replacement Project that:

“The Council has an approved budget of £3.341 million for the replacement Walnut Bridge (capital scheme P5/PR354), of which £1.535 million is to be funded by grant from Enterprise M3 LEP. As at 31 March 2018, the Council has spent £896,000 on land acquisition, preliminary works, detailed design work and procurement. The Council has drawn down £926,000 in grant from the LEP to fund this work. The period of the grant was 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2020 and the terms and conditions of the grant provide a number of milestones, which the Council has to meet.

A key milestone is that the construction work on the bridge has to commence by 31 January 2019.”

The Executive report of 28 August 2018 then states that costs to date had reached £1,024,737. My questions are:

1. How much of the LEP grant has now been drawn down?

£926,000

2. Are there any circumstances under which the grant monies could become repayable?

Yes. The grant would be repayable if we do not build the Bridge. The grant agreement is 28 pages long but, in summary, the grant may be withheld, suspended or repayment required where:

- *The recipient uses the grant for a purpose other than the one for which it is awarded*
- *The delivery of the project does not start within 6 months of the commencement date of the grant agreement*
- *The funder considers that the recipient has not made satisfactory progress with the delivery of the project*
- *The recipient obtains funding from a third party*
- *The recipient provides the funder with any materially misleading or inaccurate information*
- *The recipient fails to comply with the reporting and monitoring arrangements of the agreement*
- *The recipient fails to comply with the terms and conditions set out in the agreement*
- *Bankruptcy, insolvency, receivership, administration or liquidation for the recipient*

3. What would happen if a ‘key milestone’ were not met?

See answer to part 2 of the question above

4. Please can you provide an analysis of what the £1,024,737 was spent on with comparison to budget?

This is broken down as follows:

Salaries: £162,886 (engineers and major projects)

Construction: £91,820 (preliminaries)

Professional Fees: £641,808 - broken down as follows:

- *£526,301 design and engineering consultancy work*
- *£39,518 pre-commencement project management*
- *£36,306 legal fees*
- *£27,507 Procurement*
- *£12,176 valuation/surveyor fees*

Land Purchase: £120,000

Other: £8,223 (planning fees, D&B checks etc.)

8 EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARDS: PROPOSED REVIEW OF STRUCTURE AND REMITS (Pages 15 - 22 of the Council agenda)

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“That, before any decision is taken in respect of the future of the Executive Advisory Boards, the Council agrees to establish a cross party task and finish group of up to nine councillors, comprising five Conservative councillors and one councillor from each of the other four groups, whose terms of reference shall be:

- (a) to review the existing governance arrangements in relation to the Executive Advisory Boards and to discuss available options to improve those arrangements, including the proposal for a single Executive Advisory Board; and following that review
- (b) to make recommendations as appropriate to the Council at its meeting on 6 February 2019.”

Comments:

None

Amendment

Councillor David Goodwin to propose, and Councillor Angela Gunning to second, the following Amendment:

Substitute “*eight councillors*” in place of “*nine councillors, comprising five Conservative councillors and one councillor from each of the other four groups*”. The motion, as amended, would read as follows:

“That, before any decision is taken in respect of the future of the Executive Advisory Boards, the Council agrees to establish a cross party task and finish group of up to eight councillors, whose terms of reference shall be:

- (a) to review the existing governance arrangements in relation to the Executive Advisory Boards and to discuss available options to improve those arrangements, including the proposal for a single Executive Advisory Board; and following that review
- (b) to make recommendations as appropriate to the Council at its meeting on 6 February 2019.”

9 REVIEW OF ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES 2018-19 (Pages 23 – 30 of the Council agenda)

Request for a recorded vote:

As proposer of the motion, the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, has indicated that he would like a recorded vote in respect of the motion and any amendments being proposed. The Mayor will ask if there are four other councillors who support the request.

All votes taken in relation to this matter will only require a simple majority to be carried.

Where it is necessary, following a vote to adopt a revised calculation of the numerical allocation of seats on committees, to appoint members (or substitute) members to committees, these appointments will be made by the Managing Director in accordance with the wishes of the relevant political group as prescribed in Council Procedure Rule 23 (e).

The motion:

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to second, the adoption of the following motion:

That the Council approves the calculation of numerical allocation of seats on committees to each political group as set out in **Appendix 1** to this Order Paper.

Reasons:

- To comply with Council Procedure Rule 23 of the Constitution in respect of the appointment of committees
- To enable the Council to comply with its obligations under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 in respect of the political proportionality on its committees.

Comments:

None

10 REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC SPEAKING PROCEDURE RULES INCLUDING THE PETITION SCHEME (Pages 31 – 48 of the Council agenda)

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, to propose, and the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington to second, the adoption of the following motion:

That the proposed revisions to the Council's Public Speaking Procedure Rules and Petition Scheme, as set out in the report submitted to the Council and at Appendix 1 thereto, be adopted.

Reason:

To improve the general clarity and consistency of the Council's Public Speaking Procedure Rules.

Comments:

None

Amendment

Councillor Tony Rooth to propose, and Councillor Bob McShee to second, the following amendment:

"That, before any decision is taken in respect of the proposed revisions to the Council's Public Speaking Procedure Rules and Petition Scheme, the Council agrees to establish a cross party task and finish group (including the Independent Group) of up to eight councillors, whose terms of reference shall be:

- (a) to review the Public Speaking Procedure Rules generally and in particular:
 - (i) whether public speakers should be limited to 3 minutes each
 - (ii) whether use of visual aids should apply across all committees
 - (iii) whether a member of the public should only be allowed to ask one question at a meeting
 - (iv) whether a maximum total of 6 public speakers on one agenda item be allowed at all committees
 - (v) the approach to petitions to the council now that the Guildford Joint Committee will accept petitions with 30 signatories or more

and, following that review

- (b) to make recommendations as appropriate to the Council at its meeting on 6 February 2019."

11 REVIEW OF COUNCILLORS' ALLOWANCES 2019 – APPOINTMENT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL (Pages 49 – 54 of the Council agenda)

Update

Following publication of the agenda, a résumé on each of the three current members of the Independent Remuneration Panel was circulated to all councillors, and a copy placed in the Members' Room.

All three candidates have confirmed that they remain qualified to serve in this capacity as set out in the relevant Regulations.

The motion

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, to propose, and the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That Michael Burke, Vivienne Cameron, and Susan Tresman be appointed to the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel for a further period of four years commencing with the 2019-20 municipal year.
- (2) That the Democratic Services Manager be authorised to advertise for candidates from the general public and a wide range of organisations, including the local business community and voluntary organisations for up to two additional members of the IRP to serve for a period of four years and conduct the next review of borough councillors' allowances and the review of parish allowances within the Borough.
- (3) That the Democratic Services Manager, the Lead Councillors for Infrastructure & Governance and Finance & Asset Management, and the Director of Finance, be authorised to shortlist, interview, and recommend for selection up to two nominees for appointment to the IRP.
- (4) That the proposed timetable for appointment of the IRP and review of allowances set out in paragraph 4.11 of the report submitted to the Council, be approved.
- (5) That the honorarium to be paid to each Panel member in respect of their four-year term of office remains unchanged at £500.
- (6) That the IRP elects its own Chairman.

Reason:

In order to comply with the requirements of The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended).

Comments:

None

12 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 27 SEPTEMBER 2018 FROM COUNCILLOR TONY ROTH

Councillor Tony Rooth to propose, and Councillor Bob McShee to second, the adoption of the following motion:

"This Council fully supports the principles underlying the Local Government Transparency Code. The three key principles are democracy, accountability, and transparency which includes the requirement that all data held and managed by the Council should be made freely available in a manner which is demand-led, open, and timely to enable local people to contribute to the local decision making process and help shape public services.

In order to ensure that the Council is meeting its important obligations in this regard, the Council agrees to the establishment of an external independent review of the Council's compliance with the Code and its principles reporting back to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and then the Executive by 31 January 2019 at the latest in order to give time for the review's findings to be taken into account in the 2019-20 Budget."

Background information:

It is assumed that the motion refers to the Council's compliance with the Local Government Transparency Code 2015, as set out in The Local Government (Transparency Requirements) (England) Regulations 2015. The Council's compliance with laws and regulations is set out in the Council's constitution and overseen by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee and statutory officers (e.g. Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer).

The Council's internal audit programme also reviews compliance with laws and regulations on a risk assessed basis. In 2016-17, Internal Audit undertook a review of the council's compliance with the Transparency Code 2015 and reported its results in the Summary of Internal Audit Reports October 2016 to March 2017 presented to the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee on 27 July 2017 and as such are available as part of the Committee agenda papers on the Council's website. The internal audit was outsourced to a contractor, Plainsong Consulting Ltd who carried out the review on behalf of internal audit. The findings of the review as set out in the report are repeated in the paragraphs below.

The review compared the Council's current processes with the government's requirements. The review found:

- The hit rate on the Transparency web page was not significant which could be due to accessibility issues, lack of interest or knowledge
- The Transparency web page includes information that is not required under the Transparency Code.
- There is some inconsistency in the information provided. For example expenditure, the Council publishes information on all expenditure when it is only required to publish information on spend above £500. However, the Council does not publish redacted information on expense payments to staff, which is a current requirement.
- Some information is out of date. For example, the information on Voluntary Grants is for 2014/15 and the Parking Business Plan is for 2015/16.
- Not all information is published in a format that satisfies the Three Star requirement. Some are published as PDF documents, which means that the information cannot be manipulated or easily analysed.
- There is no single person responsible for the oversight of the Transparency Agenda to ensure that the Code is being complied with or that changes in the requirements of the Code are covered. (This is why, for example, the Council is not publishing information on payment of expenses. The officers responsible for publishing spend information were unaware that this was required by the revised Code published in February 2015.)

The review found that the Council's biggest challenge will be to comply with the publication of information in relation to procurement. The Council is required to publish details of the tender for any contract valued at more than £5,000 and the details of any contract awarded valued at more than £5,000. This includes formal contracts and any goods or services purchased through an order. Some information is published, but the review found that it appeared to be limited to a number of building contracts. We need to build the publication of this information into the procurement process to ensure that all qualifying transactions are identified. This is the area that there could be highest risk of a challenge to the Council and is currently under review.

The following recommendations were made by Internal Audit:

- The Web Team carries out a review of the Transparency web page in order to reduce the content and increase traffic to the page.
- The Council considers publicising the information in order to improve public awareness and increase traffic to the page.
- The Council reviews the content of the web page to ensure that it is up to date.
- The Council should ensure that where the Transparency information is published in a larger document, it is also published as an extract in the appropriate format to provide accessibility and utility.
- The Council should publish all information in the appropriate format to achieve the Three Star level required by the Code.
- The Council should make an officer responsible for the oversight of the Council's response to the Transparency Agenda.
- There should be a review of the Council's procurement processes to ensure that services are aware of their responsibilities to record tender and contract details.

Audit Opinion – Limited Assurance

Since the Internal Audit review, Council officers have been working on implementing the recommendations. Progress against the audit recommendations is currently the subject of a follow-up audit being undertaken by KPMG (the Council's new internal audit contractor) which is due to report soon. The result of the follow up audit will be presented as part of the Summary of Internal Audit Reports to the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee on 29 November 2018. In light of the work already undertaken on this matter by Internal Audit and our outsourced internal audit contractors, Officers do not feel that a further external review overseen by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee would add value at this stage. It is suggested that the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee reviews the findings of the follow-up audit and oversees any further implementation plan to improve the Council's compliance with the code.

Comments:

None

13 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 27 SEPTEMBER 2018 FROM COUNCILLOR NILS CHRISTIANSEN

Councillor Nils Christiansen to propose, and Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“This Council considers that the long term health and wellbeing of our residents is a priority. We are fortunate that Guildford residents are already amongst the healthiest and longest lived in the country, but our ambition is higher. Simply put, we want our residents to lead the longest, healthiest, and happiest lives they can, which we will measure by comparing our population health outcomes with the best in the world.

We recognise the important role of a well-functioning health system in achieving this, but understand that the wider determinants of health are ultimately more important in achieving improved population outcomes. These can often be heavily influenced by the day-to-day decisions we all make. To achieve significant change we need both an integrated approach to health and care, and a system-wide focus on the wider determinants of health.

In order to achieve this, the Council resolves to ensure that due consideration is given in all decision making as to how any decision will promote and support the improved health and wellbeing of residents.”

Comments:

None

14 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Pages 55 - 70 of the Council agenda)

To receive and note the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 17 July, 28 August, and 4 September 2018, which are attached to the Council agenda.

Comments:
None

15 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

The Mayor, Councillor Mike Parsons to propose, and the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington to second, the following motion:

“That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of the business contained in agenda items 16 and 17 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act”.

16 USE OF URGENT POWERS DELEGATED TO THE MANAGING DIRECTOR (Pages 71 - 90 of the Council agenda)

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to second, the following motion:

That the Council notes the urgent action taken by the Managing Director, as described in the report submitted to the Council.

Reason:

To comply with the requirement of paragraph 2 of the Responsibilities and Powers of the Managing Director/Head of Paid Service in the scheme of delegation to officers in Part 3 of the Council’s Constitution”.

Comments
None

17 INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITY UPDATE (Pages 91 - 142 of the Council agenda)

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner to second, the following motion:

That the Council notes the update report from the Director of Finance.

Comments
None

18 COMMON SEAL

To order the Common Seal.

Appendix 1

Draft Calculation of the Numerical Allocation of Seats on Committees: 2018-19

Committee	Conservatives	Liberal Democrats	Guildford Greenbelt Group	Labour	Independent Group
Total no. of seats on the Council	32	9	3	2	2
% of no. of seats on the Council	66.66%	18.75%	6.25%	4.17%	4.17%
Corporate Governance & Standards Committee (7 seats)	4.67 seats rounded up to 5	1.31 seats rounded down to 1	0.44 seats rounded down to 0	0.29 seats rounded down to 0	0.29 seats rounded up to 1
Employment Committee (3 seats)	1.99 seats rounded up to 2	0.56 seats rounded up to 1	0.19 seats rounded down to 0	0.13 seats rounded down to 0	0.13 seats rounded down to 0
Community EAB (12 seats)	7.99 seats rounded up to 8	2.25 seats rounded down to 2	0.75 seats rounded down to 0	0.5 seats rounded up to 1	0.5 seats rounded up to 1
Place Making & Innovation EAB (12 seats)	7.99 seats rounded up to 8	2.25 seats rounded down to 2	0.75 seats rounded up to 1	0.5 seats rounded down to 0	0.5 seats rounded up to 1
Guildford Joint Committee (11 seats)	7.33 seats rounded down to 7	2.06 seats rounded down to 2	0.69 seats rounded up to 1	0.46 seats rounded down to 0	0.46 seats rounded up to 1
Licensing Committee (15 seats)	9.99 seats rounded up to 10	2.81 seats rounded up to 3	0.94 seats rounded up to 1	0.63 seats rounded up to 1	0.63 seats rounded down to 0
Overview & Scrutiny Committee (12 seats)	7.99 seats rounded up to 8	2.25 seats rounded down to 2	0.75 seats rounded up to 1	0.5 seats rounded up to 1	0.5 seats rounded down to 0
Planning Committee (15 seats)	9.99 seats rounded up to 10	2.81 seats rounded up to 3	0.94 seats rounded up to 1	0.63 seats rounded up to 1	0.63 seats rounded down to 0
Total no. of seats on committees (87 seats)	58 57.99 seats rounded up to 58	16 16.31 seats rounded down to 16	5 5.44 seats rounded down to 5	4 3.63 seats rounded up to 4	4 3.63 seats rounded up to 4