



GUILDFORD  
B O R O U G H

**James Whiteman**  
Managing Director

**[www.guildford.gov.uk](http://www.guildford.gov.uk)**

Dear Councillor

**EXECUTIVE - TUESDAY, 26TH NOVEMBER, 2019**

Please find attached the following:

**Agenda No    Item**

18.    **Late Sheet (Pages 1 - 6)**

Yours sincerely

John Armstrong, Democratic Services Manager  
01483 444102

Encs

This page is intentionally left blank

## EXECUTIVE

26 NOVEMBER 2019

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

#### Procedure for the discharge of business at this meeting

The Leader of the Council, as chairman of the Executive, welcomes the attendance of members of the public and non-Executive councillors at this meeting of the Executive.

The procedure for dealing with each item of business shall be as follows:

1. Lead Councillor to introduce report on the matter
2. Members of the public invited to ask a question or comment, for which they will have a maximum of **three** minutes each
3. Opportunity for councillors to ask questions of the public speaker(s)
4. Non-Executive councillors invited to ask a question or comment, for which they will have a maximum of **five** minutes each
5. Lead councillor to respond to comments and questions
6. Executive debates the matter
7. Chairman to invite Executive to make decision on the matter

#### **Item 5: REVIEW OF COUNCILLORS ALLOWANCES (Agenda pages 7-56)**

Lead Councillor: Councillor Joss Bigmore

Lead Officer: John Armstrong

The chair of the Independent Remuneration Panel, Mark Palmer will introduce the Panel's report and comment on their recommendations. Panel member, Vivienne Cameron will also be in attendance to assist in answering any questions from councillors.

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Customer Services to propose, for discussion, the following recommendation to Council (3 December 2019):

"That the Council adopts the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel, subject to the amendment of recommendations (2) and (11) (see pages 7 and 8 of the agenda) as follows:

- (2) That no councillor shall be entitled to receive at any *given* time more than one Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA), *except in circumstances where a councillor in receipt of an SRA is also entitled to receive the Group Leader's SRA*, and that this 'One SRA Only Rule' be adopted into the Scheme of Allowances.
- (11) That Political Group Leaders continue to receive a Special Responsibility Allowance of 1% of the Basic Allowance per group member (£74 per councillor per annum) ~~subject to the application of the 'One SRA Only' rule.~~"

**Item 6: PARISH COUNCILS – CONCURRENT FUNCTIONS GRANT AID: APPLICATIONS FOR ASSISTANCE 2020-21 (Agenda pages 57-66)**

Lead Councillors: Councillor Joss Bigmore

Lead Officer: Claire Morris

**Item 7: LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2020-21 (Agenda pages 67-98)**

Lead Councillors: Councillor Angela Goodwin and Councillor Joss Bigmore

Lead Officer: Claire Morris

**Item 8: BUSINESS PLANNING - GENERAL FUND OUTLINE BUDGET 20-21 (Agenda pages 99-124)**

Lead Councillor: Councillor Joss Bigmore

Lead Officer: Claire Morris

**Correction:**

Paragraph 11.9 of the report states that the estimated directorate level expenditure excluding depreciation is £11.66m. This figure has been amended to include the growth bids outlined in the report and is now £12.75m. The amended paragraph is shown below.

Major changes from 2019-20

11.9 The estimated directorate level expenditure excluding depreciation charges for 2020-21 is £12.75 million, which is £0.23 million less than the 2019-20 directorate level expenditure estimate of £12.98 million. The major variances are set out in **Appendix 2**.

**Comments from the Joint Executive Advisory Board (20 November 2019)**

The following points arose from related questions and discussion:

- In response to a Councillor's expressed wish for the NHB reserve to be directed primarily towards funding housing delivery, the Board was advised that the proposed Town Centre Masterplan included provision for housing delivery and that a policy agreed by the Council in 2016 specified the use of the NHB reserve for new housing and a range of other initiatives.
- A councillor suggested that the Democratic Services staffing resource should be increased in order to meet the support demands of the many new and inexperienced councillors. Although this was unlikely at present given the current budget deficit and staff reductions as part of the Future Guildford programme, the matter could be discussed by relevant Lead Councillors.
- In response to a suggestion that planting schemes be included in the budget, the Board was advised that such initiatives may emerge from the Climate Change and Innovation Board and that higher-level schemes would take priority.

- Options for the future use of an empty investment property would be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 26 November 2019.
- The Joint EAB Task Group had indicated its support for the proposed budget growth bids and related queries had been referred to service managers for clarification and response. It was queried whether climate change proposals were sufficiently ambitious.
- The Council was collaborating with neighbouring local authorities and the Forestry Commission with a view to minimising the risk from the Oak Processionary Moth.

In conclusion, the EAB noted the current 2020-21 outline budget position and indicated its support for the recommendations to the Executive contained within the report.

### **Item 9: PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS TO CHAPEL LANE, CASTLE STREET AND SWAN LANE, GUILDFORD (Agenda pages 125-162)**

#### Public Speakers:

Bill Bromham (Holy Trinity Amenity Group)  
Matthew Bayliss (South Hill Steering Group)

Lead Councillor: Councillor Caroline Reeves

Lead Officer: Paul Bassi

#### **Comments from the Joint Executive Advisory Board (20 November 2019)**

Arising from related discussion and questions, the following points were made:

- Depictions of the improvement options, including the proposed bollards, in visual format were welcomed.
- The inclusion of Swan Lane in any options was welcomed and it was felt that the proposed treatment of Chapel and Castle Streets was positive.
- A safety audit of all scheme options would be undertaken and cobbles would be reused where possible.
- In response to a suggestion that Surrey County Council as local highway authority should make a financial contribution towards the improvement work, the Board was advised that this was unlikely as the standard of the proposal was significantly higher than general maintenance work for which the County Council was statutorily responsible. However, the County Council may provide some stone paving setts.
- In addition to the three improvement funding options of use of the NHB reserve, retained business rates or borrowing, use of crowdfunding was suggested and the Board was advised that consideration was currently being given to the establishment of a wider Council crowdfunding platform.
- Market testing had taken place prior to the appointment of consultants and the costs reflected the complex nature of the works above and below ground and the need for contingencies.
- Concerns in relation to costs, particularly in relation to the Castle Street Square raised table, and highway safety, mainly associated with traffic speed and loss of traffic islands, and the severity of the proposed gates were raised. The use of traffic calming measures was suggested as one solution. Although the highway authority did not hold any speed data for the

Castle Street junction, it had reviewed it with a view to solving traffic issues and had approved the design for the corner in Castle Street. A traffic regulation order could be pursued at the detailed design stage.

- It was noted that the plan on page 59 of the agenda depicted the gate opening in the wrong direction.
- The consultation exercise in relation to the improvement project was appreciated and it was noted that further consultation would take place once firmer proposals had been agreed by the Executive.
- Some planting was included in the options and consideration could be given to supplementing this.
- Accessibility should take account of older and vulnerable people.
- Measures, such as public artwork, to improve the appearance of buildings in Swan Lane were welcomed.
- Consistency in street furniture design to reflect the historic nature of the High Street Conservation Area would be pursued.
- Measures to mitigate the impact of restaurant delivery vehicles in part of Castle Street were being discussed. It was noted that there was a trend of moving towards centralised multi-brand out of town kitchens which would resolve this issue.

Having indicated its support for option 2 of the improvement project, the Board agreed that the recommendations to the Executive contained in the report should be modified to read as follows to address its views and concerns:

That the Executive:

- (1) Approves Option 2 and agrees to progress to detailed design and construction.
- (2) Authorises officers to proceed with the detailed designs for the preferred option.
- (3) Approves that the full capital cost of the preferred option is funded from the Council's New Homes Bonus Reserve, subject to recommendation (4).
- (4) Explores further funding options for the improvement project.
- (5) Gives further consideration to road layout and design at the junction of South Hill, Sydenham Road and Castle Street to reduce traffic speeds and ease crossing by pedestrians.

Councillor John Redpath has asked the Executive to note the following concerns of some residents of Holy Trinity ward:

- alterations to the South Hill/Sydenham Road junction may result in the speeding up of traffic at the junction
- removal of two pedestrian islands (one in Sydenham Road and one in South Hill) will make it more difficult to cross the road
- raised table (Castle Square) at the top of Castle Street is both too expensive and is unnecessary
- levelling of the road surface with the pavement in Chapel Street is not in keeping with the heritage aspect of the street
- project is too expensive and the money would be better spent elsewhere
- traders in Chapel Street will be affected and suffer from the works to Chapel Street if this work is excessive (i.e. more than just relaying the setts)

- making Castle Street One Way up to the South Hill junction will affect trade due to restricted access to Tunsgate Car Park and for deliveries

**Item 10: MIDDLETON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE REDEVELOPMENT (Agenda pages 163-182)**

Lead Councillor: Councillor Joss Bigmore

Lead Officer: Philip o' Dwyer

**Item 11: CLIMATE CHANGE AND ENERGY MANAGEMENT – SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE (Agenda pages 183-186)**

Lead Councillor: Councillor Caroline Reeves

Lead Officer: Philip O'Dwyer

**Item 12: SELECTION OF THE MAYOR AND DEPUTY MAYOR 2020-21 (Agenda pages 187-190)**

Lead Councillor: Councillor Caroline Reeves

Lead Officer: John Armstrong

**Item 13: EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

The Executive is invited to consider the following resolution:

That under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and Regulation 5 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business 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.”

**Item 14: PROPOSED DISPOSAL OF COUNCIL-OWNED PROPERTY IN GUILDFORD (Pink agenda pages 191-204)**

Lead Councillor: Councillor Joss Bigmore

Lead Officer: Philip O'Dwyer

**Item 14: LEASE OF PROPERTY IN TOWN CENTRE (Pink agenda pages 205-212)**

Lead Councillor: Councillor Joss Bigmore

Lead Officer: Philip O'Dwyer

This page is intentionally left blank