



COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2019

ORDER PAPER

WEBCASTING NOTICE

This meeting will be recorded for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website. 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 make a representation to the meeting, you will be deemed to have consented to being recorded. By entering the Council Chamber, you are also consenting to being recorded and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

If you have any queries regarding webcasting of meetings, please contact Committee Services on 01483 444102.

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 relevant to the functions, powers, or duties of the Council. It also sets out details of any written questions to be asked by councillors, together with any motions or 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 the Public Participation item, 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 Richard Billington
The Mayor of Guildford*

This page is intentionally left blank

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 – 24 of the Council agenda)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 8 October 2019.

4 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

To receive any communications or announcements from the Mayor.

5 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

There are no communications from the Leader this evening.

6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Question:

Keith Chesterton, on behalf of the Defend our Bus Station Group, to ask the Leader of the Council the following question:

"Can the Leader of the Council, on behalf of Guildford Borough Council, please make every effort to keep the bus station in its present location, but also to make sure it is improved?"

Bus passengers have made it plain on several occasions that overwhelmingly they want the bus station where it is but for it to be improved.

In 2017, the Council commissioned Systra to do consultations with stakeholders, including bus passengers, on the design and location of bus facilities in the centre of Guildford.

The summary report (GBC Ref 1056142) makes it clear that the vast majority of stakeholders, and certainly bus passengers wanted the bus station to remain where it is now but to improve it.

This confirmed what I with other members of the Defend our Bus station Group, found when in 2011/12 we spoke to hundreds of bus users at the bus station. We also

collected 2,600 signatures to a petition “Don’t Move the Bus Station – Improve It”. Nothing has happened since to invalidate the results.

The primary reason for the Council wanting to move the bus station in the first place was so that John Lewis and a major shopping development with car park could be put in its place. Economic changes have now made that impossible.

Others wanted a full bus interchange at the railway station. This would always have been difficult but the Solum development has now made that impossible.

Thus the two reasons for moving it have disappeared.

The bus station is an essential part of the infrastructure of Guildford and should not be moved to suit the convenience of developers.”

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

“The Policy allocation (A5) for North Street redevelopment includes a requirement (point 8) that the ‘Bus interchange facilities presently provided at Guildford bus station on the site are to be provided in a suitable alternative arrangement to be located either partly or wholly on or off site.’ Maintaining suitable bus interchange facilities in Guildford town centre is a key consideration in relation to any forthcoming planning application for the site.

The Council are aware of issues with the current facility. In line with the Local Plan policy, we will be working with the developer at North Street to secure provision of a suitable alternative to meet passenger needs.

There will be public consultation on redevelopment proposals for the North Street site, including in relation to the Bus Station, as part of the planning process.”

Councillor Caroline Reeves
Leader of the Council

7 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- (a) **Councillor Steven Lee** to ask the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery, Councillor Jan Harwood the following question:

“Guildford has a huge and persistent problem with regular traffic jams and congestion. We were recently named the most congested town in England and the issue ranked as number one with our residents in a recent poll.

With the planned development for Guildford and its environs over the next ten to fifteen years, there is a unique window of opportunity to work with County Highways and Highways England to overhaul our road infrastructure and thereby reduce congestion as part of the framework of development.

Given this, can the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration and Housing Delivery tell us whether the planning department has considered creating a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to identify and safeguard potential future routes for new road infrastructure to alleviate traffic through Guildford - whether that be access points for a tunnel, a bypass route or any other practical option? If not, would they be willing to consider creating such an SPD?”

The Lead Councillor's response is as follows:

"The Council works with both Surrey County Council and Highways England, respectively the statutory highway authorities for local and strategic roads.

The now adopted Local Plan: Strategy and Sites was prepared with the active involvement of both Surrey County Council and Highways England (and its predecessor the Highways Agency) in the period from 2012. The Council worked with these and other partners to align their strategies and investments for transport with our forward planning of development patterns. As the Local Plan inspector noted in his report on the plan, the Council worked 'through an extensive number of working groups and stakeholder meetings' on transport matters (para 17).

It should be noted that specific requirements for junctions on the local and strategic road networks to be provided or have their capacity increased are set out in site allocation policies including for the strategic sites in the adopted Local Plan: Strategy and Sites. Highways England and Surrey County Council were statutory consultees for the public consultations on the draft versions of the plan, and their comments with respect to proposed changes to the local and strategic road networks were taken into account by Guildford Borough Council in the preparation of the plan.

Beyond those proposed changes to the local and strategic road networks described in the adopted plan, neither Highways England nor Surrey County Council requested, or has since made a request, that Guildford Borough Council further allocates or safeguards land for potential future routes for new public road infrastructure.

It is worth noting that, in agreement with Network Rail, the site allocation as Policy A7 Land west of Guildford railway station, was "allocated for a 'Guildford platform capacity' scheme involving additional platforms and layout changes at Guildford railway station as proposed in the Wessex Route Study". Policy A28 allocates a site for a new rail station at Guildford West (Park Barn) on the North Downs Line adjacent to the Royal Surrey County Hospital.

In the statutory spatial planning arena, sites can only be allocated for new highway or transport infrastructure or safeguarded for potential future new highway or transport infrastructure through the preparation of a Local Plan (which is a Development Plan Document). This cannot be done through a Supplementary Planning Document. In a future review of the Local Plan, or preparation of a new Local Plan, it would be possible to explore whether further allocations or safeguarding for highway infrastructure can be justified at that time. This would need to be evidence based and be promoted/supported by the relevant highway authority.

Statutory highway authorities, including Highways England and Surrey County Council, also have bespoke statutory powers such as the power to prescribe improvement lines for widening public highways (under the Highways Act 1980 as modified) and Development Consent Orders (under the Planning Act 2008)".

Councillor Jan Harwood

Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery

- (b) **Councillor Tony Rooth** to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, the following question:

"In view of the challenges faced to keep our town centre vibrant, our retailers trading and our shops open could the Leader of the Council confirm what steps the Council is taking to bring residents and visitors alike into our town by making attractions such as the Guildhall more available and open to the public?"

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

“While we do have a number of empty retail sites in the town, the most recent visitor numbers show an improvement from 2017, with 4.9 million tourism trips to the Borough with an improved overall spend of over £238.2 million and I believe we have worked hard to deliver an enhanced Visit Guildford brand through a new dedicated website and social media reach. The Tourist Information Centre also works hard to support town centre events and sells tickets for a number of key arts/cultural organisations. The retail sector everywhere has suffered and the issue of over inflated rents in this area will have to be addressed by the site owners or landlords. Of course, if a national chain folds then the store in Guildford will close even if it was successful. It should be noted that our independent stores have succeeded in bucking the trend.

A number of initiatives to support increased footfall have been undertaken and include:

- *Five new specialist markets in the High Street this year (Vegan and antique markets) that have been really successful*
- *Events like Innovate Guildford and the Digital Games Festival have brought new visitors to Guildford*
- *We are currently discussing tailored walks with the town guides for local employers and we have sent over 100 welcome packs to local businesses that include tourism and events information covering the town centre.*
- *Specifically looking at the retail sector following our meeting with Experience Guildford we agreed to explore the opportunities for more training with retailers on e-commerce and digital marketing – a number of retailers have also benefited from GBC business grants. We are mapping the ownership of units to see if we can identify ways of influencing the institutional owners to be more proactive in promoting their shops and looking at whether we can put in temporary vinyls to improve the appearance of empty units and also look at opportunities for pop-up shops.*

We could be proactive in promoting the Guildhall for Corporate use (businesses that attended business leaders' dinners in the past have often asked about it). There is also an idea that the Guildhall or the Brewhouse could be used for music recitals. However, given both buildings are listed there may be additional costs incurred in being maintained as regular venues with health and safety considerations for this kind of use.

A few years ago, we set up a study group to look at the use of town centre venues, perhaps this should be reviewed through an Executive Advisory Board?”

Councillor Caroline Reeves
Leader of the Council

- (c) **Councillor John Redpath** to ask the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery, Councillor Jan Harwood, the following question:

“This Council agreed unanimously in July that it wants to master plan the town centre appointing a best in class multi-disciplinary team of external experts to identify the best possible options for the town. The question about progress asked at the last council meeting received a noncommittal reply. After years of town centre deterioration and obfuscation on this subject it was assumed by many councillors the council motion required action now.

The challenges of congestion, pollution, accidents, inadequate housing delivery, missed environmental opportunities around the river and poor public realm require action.

I would like to ask will the Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration and Housing Delivery confirm that he will instruct the Director of Planning and Regeneration to abide by this unanimous motion to appoint external best in class experts immediately in order to produce the best outcomes which can be identified and implemented by the most appropriate planning route?"

The Lead Councillor's response is as follows:

"The process described in the Council resolution [item CO29, 23 July 2019] has and is being progressed. In this regard, the Planning and Regeneration Department is driving this by:

- (1) conducting stakeholder engagement toward developing a set of shared objectives for revitalising Guildford town centre (People and Places are appointed to assist the Council) and the draft report will be ready this month;*
- (2) reviewing previous work commissioned in relation to the Town Centre including previous masterplanning, with a view to informing the next steps and further work (David Lock and Associates are appointed to assist the Council). Again this initial work will be with GBC shortly; and*
- (3) submitting a funding bid to Council, which anticipates further work required to progress in line with the Council resolution. It is intended that this bid will be considered in February 2020 and be included in the budget for the next financial year".*

Councillor Jan Harwood
Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration, and Housing Delivery

- (d) **Councillor Deborah Seabrook** to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, the following question:

Residents are disappointed that the county council are not moving to Guildford, the county town. It feels like a missed opportunity.

I would like to ask the Leader of the Council:

- (a) What efforts did the leadership make to persuade Surrey County Council to choose Guildford?*
- (b) What was the strategy and how and by whom was it agreed?*
- (c) Who led the bid team and what was its composition?*
- (d) Why was there no communication or consultation with the whole council about negotiations?*
- (e) Why was Woking chosen in preference to Guildford?*
- (f) What is the assessment (including but not limited to financial aspects) of the impact and lost opportunity for Guildford of SCC's move to Woking?*
- (g) What has been learned and put into practice to ensure Guildford does not lose out on any future opportunities?*

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

"As part of the 'Moving Closer to Residents' project launched by Surrey County Council (SCC) in late 2018, SCC initially advised borough and district (B&D) councils

of its intention to move out of County Hall in Kingston into Surrey by the end of 2020. The programme for doing so is based on increasingly agile ways of working for most staff and the creation of a 'Civic Heart', based in the county, accommodating Councillors, (including Cabinet and Scrutiny Committee meetings), the Corporate Leadership Team, democratic services and aspects of other support services such as legal and finance services. The 'Civic Heart' was described at that stage as needing to be owned freehold by SCC and potentially comprising around 250 staff but only requiring 100 to 150 desks as staff would be working in increasingly agile ways. In order to identify a new location for the Civic Heart, SCC embarked upon a search exercise, focused on Guildford and Woking as preferred locations, in the following three stages:

- (1) SCC contacted all B&D councils in the county to ask if any of them had any buildings within their asset portfolios that may be suitable for the 'Civic Heart',
- (2) SCC employed two property agents to identify a building in Surrey to which a cohort of staff from County Hall, comprising those that work most closely in support of Members and the democratic procedures and processes of the Council (i.e. the Civic Heart) could be relocated to.
- (3) SCC employed property agents to source a suitable building in Surrey large enough to provide the opportunity to move most staff from County Hall, and some other locations, into a single building.

A link to the SCC Cabinet papers for September and November detailing their 'Closer to Residents' project can be found on their website but for convenience the links are:

<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/s63147/item%2015%20-%20MCTR%20Cabinet%20Report%20300819%20DRAFT%20v0.4.2.1.pdf>

<https://mycouncil.surreycc.gov.uk/documents/g6331/Public%20reports%20pack%20Tuesday%2026-Nov-2019%2014.00%20Cabinet.pdf?T=10>

Other reports detailing the project can also be found on SCC's website.

In late 2018, Guildford along with a number of other councils responded to SCC's initial request with the details of a number of assets within our portfolio that we thought may be suitable, the list included Guildford Borough Council's Millmead Offices. The reason for including the Millmead offices was that through our Future Guildford Programme and our own move towards more agile working, the Council does have over 100 desk spaces available within our own building that were offered to SCC. SCC holds its Council and Committee meetings during the day whereas GBC holds its meetings in the evening. Officers also understand that Guildford's Council Chamber is the only Council chamber of the B&D councils in Surrey that is large enough to host a SCC full Council meeting. As such officers considered that there was significant opportunity for sharing office space between the two councils.

In response to specific questions.

(a) What efforts did the leadership make to persuade Surrey County Council to choose Guildford?

As SCC's business case has progressed over the last 12 months, a number of meetings between officers of the two councils were held including meetings between Chief Executive / Managing Director, Directors, Property, Facilities and ICT staff. In addition, officers understand that informal conversations between the former Leader and Deputy Leader and SCC's Leader and key members of the SCC Cabinet were also held. Guildford Officers also provided considerable information regarding the Millmead Offices to Surrey Officers and we understand a number of Surveys were undertaken at Millmead by SCC to help inform their

business case. Since the May 2019 election, Officers have briefed the new Leader (GBC), Deputy Leader and Lead Councillor for Finance, Assets and Customer Service regarding the on-going discussions between the two councils about SCC sharing Guildford's Millmead offices for the purposes of its Civic Heart.

In October 2019, we heard that SCC had identified a suitable building in Woking as the new Headquarters (HQ) for SCC. This coincided with our own situation where one of our commercial properties was now vacant and this was having a large financial impact on this Council. One of the options discussed internally at this Council was to look and see if there was scope for this council to move to that site and allow SCC to lease the Millmead site for their HQ. The MD approached SCC's Chief Executive to gauge the level of interest there might be for SCC to lease the Millmead site, potentially fully furnished, and for us to move to our other building. SCC indicated they would wish to take freehold ownership of any building, so the proposal was revised to consider selling the freehold of the whole site to SCC, again potentially fully furnished. Please note that we had not worked up any acquisition costs or costs for us to move to another site at this time – these were simply early discussions. The SCC Council Leader and Chief Executive visited GBC offices, Managing Director and Leader in early October to again view the site. Clearly, we had not been through appropriate consultation exercises with our staff, councillors or public so could not make any decisions. We had simply wanted to test the possibilities of a proposal of this nature with a view to trying to secure the SCC HQ here at Guildford and addressing our financial challenge in relation to the other building. In view of some of the challenges raised by the whole site (e.g. Annex, partial acquisition, access, etc.) and SCC's timeline for definitively settling matters which ran ahead of our own internal processes the proposal was not developed any further. SCC made an announcement regarding their move to Woking at the end of October 2019.

(b) What was the strategy and how and by whom was it agreed?

There was no formal strategy. Initial discussions were focussed around building a business case for SCC to share Guildford's Millmead offices and civic suite. The reason this idea was pursued was to increase partnership/joint working, share costs of office accommodation and enable better utilisation of Council offices. Our indicative proposal in October 2019 was a reaction to hearing about the main HQ being at Woking and addressing our financial challenge with our commercial building.

(c) Who led the bid team and what was its composition?

There was no 'bid team' as SCC's approach was not to invite bids but to collaboratively discuss options with B&D councils. Later in the process, SCC engaged two property agents to search the local market for suitable offices that were not already in public sector ownership. The Managing Director, Director of Finance, Facilities Manager and Corporate Property Manager were the staff most involved in discussions with SCC Chief Executive, Director of Transformation and Property Officers.

(d) Why was there no communication or consultation with the whole council about negotiations?

The former Council had previously agreed, as part of the savings proposals for its 2017-18 budget, to lease out spare office space within the Millmead offices to generate rental income. Under the Council's Constitution, a decision to lease a part of the Council's Millmead offices (or any of our property) is a decision that would be taken under Officer delegated authority by the Corporate Property Manager, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Finance, Assets and Customer Services. The Council already has a number of tenants within its

Millmead offices and the decision to lease the vacant space to those tenants and on what terms is an operational decision.

That said, if it had become apparent that the option of sharing the Millmead offices with SCC was SCC's preferred option then the Full Council would have been informed.

Also, the option discussed in October 2019 to potentially sell the Millmead site to SCC could only have proceeded with full consultation having taken place with staff, councillors and the public. As stated previously, aspects of the site and disposal, along with SCC's timetable did not allow for this this option to be developed any further.

(e) Why was Woking chosen in preference to Guildford?

This is a matter for SCC and is set out in the SCC Cabinet report referenced (and link provided) above.

(f) What is the assessment (including but limited to financial aspects) of the impact and lost opportunity for Guildford of SCC's move to Woking?

We have not carried out an assessment and do not feel it would be a valuable use of time or money to undertake one. The office space at Millmead is in the process of being leased to SCC for their 'Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH)' so it is not anticipated that there will be a loss of rental income. Other office space at Millmead is also already leased to SCC for its Guildford Adult Social Care team and discussions are also on-going about SCC locating other teams at Millmead in the future subject to space availability.

(g) What has been learned and put into practice to ensure Guildford does not lose out on any future opportunities?

Joint working between the two councils continues as it has always done. Where opportunities to collaborate and share services or property arise Officers will continue to explore them. The fact that there is no available vacant office block large enough to accommodate SCC's needs at a price it can afford in Guildford is somewhat outside of this Council's control. However, the Council's adopted local plan does make provision for the development of further employment space within the town centre."

Councillor Caroline Reeves
Leader of the Council

8 LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2020-21 (Pages 25 - 56 of the Council Agenda)

Note:

At its meeting on 26 November 2019, the Executive considered this matter and endorsed the recommendations contained in the report to Council.

The motion:

The Lead Councillor for Housing, Access and Disability, Councillor Angela Goodwin, to propose, and the Lead Councillor for Finance and Assets, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the current Local Council Tax Support Scheme be amended for 2020-21, as set out in detail in Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, with effect from 1 April 2020.
- (2) That the Council maintains a discretionary hardship fund of £40,000 in 2020-21.

Reasons:

- (1) To ensure that the Council complies with legislation to implement a Local Council Tax Support Scheme from 1 April 2020.
- (2) To maintain a discretionary fund to help applicants suffering from severe financial hardship.

Comments:

None

9 REVIEW OF COUNCILLORS' ALLOWANCES – REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL (Pages 57 - 106 of the Council Agenda)

Note:

At its meeting on 26 November 2019, the Executive considered this matter and submitted the following recommendation to the Council:

“That the Council adopts the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel, subject to the amendment of recommendations (2) and (11) (see pages 57 and 58 of the Council 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.~~

Since the Executive meeting, the Leader has indicated that, having given the matter further consideration and having discussed the matter informally with Executive colleagues, if a councillor holds more than one position of special responsibility, which attracts a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) under the new scheme of allowances, they should receive the SRAs to which they are entitled. Accordingly, it is suggested that the Council should not adopt the Panel's "One SRA Only Rule" recommendation.

The motion:

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Assets, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore to move, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the Council adopts the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel, subject to the deletion of recommendation (2) on page 57 of the Council agenda and amendment of recommendation (11) on page 58 of the Council agenda as follows:
 - “(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.~~”
- (2) That the draft Scheme of Allowances as set out in Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, incorporating the proposed amendments to the IRP's

recommendations referred to in paragraph (1) above, be adopted with effect from 1 April 2020, at which time the current scheme of allowances shall be revoked.

Reason:

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

Comments:

None

10 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW OF THE PARISHES OF EAST HORSLEY AND EFFINGHAM (Pages 107 - 134 of the Council agenda)

Councillor Liz Hogger to propose, and Councillor Catherine Young to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That, taking account of the statutory considerations, the Council agrees the outcome of the community governance review as follows:
 - (a) to alter, with effect from 1 April 2023, the existing boundary between the parish of East Horsley and the North Ward of the parish of Effingham in the area close to Effingham Common along the route shown in the terms of reference of the review, subject to the further alteration described in paragraph 9.2 (b) of the report submitted to the Council (for the avoidance of doubt, the route of the further alteration is shown as a broken red line in the plan appended to this Order Paper with the existing parish boundary shown as a blue line)
 - (b) to recommend to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England that it approves, as a consequential change, an alteration of the existing boundary between the Clandon and Horsley ward and the Effingham ward of the Borough Council so that it is coterminous with the change to the parish boundary referred to in (a) above;
 - (c) to increase the number of parish councillors to be elected to East Horsley Parish Council from nine to twelve with effect from the next scheduled parish council elections in May 2023; and
 - (d) to make no other changes:
 - (i) to the parishes of East Horsley and Effingham or
 - (ii) to the electoral arrangements for East Horsley Parish Council and Effingham Parish Council.
- (2) That the Democratic Services Manager be authorised to make a community governance reorganisation order under Sections 86 and 88 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to give effect to the decision approved in paragraph (1) above, together with all necessary incidental, consequential, transitional or supplementary provisions as may be required to give full effect to the order.

Reason:

To ensure that community governance within the area under review is:

- reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
- is effective and convenient

Comments:

None

11 TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE ENFORCEMENT – DELEGATIONS FOR SURREY JOINT WARRANTING (Pages 135 – 142 of the Council agenda)Note:

At its meeting on 25 September 2019, the Licensing Committee considered this matter and endorsed the recommendation shown in the report submitted to the Council.

The motion:

The Lead Councillor for Waste, Licensing, and Parking, Councillor David Goodwin, to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the Council's Taxi and Private Hire enforcement powers, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be delegated jointly to the following licensing authorities:

- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Woking Borough Council

without prejudice to the Council's ability to exercise those powers itself within the Borough.

- (2) That similar delegated Taxi and Private Hire enforcement powers be accepted from the following licensing authorities:

- Elmbridge Borough Council
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
- Mole Valley District Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Runnymede Borough Council
- Spelthorne Borough Council
- Surrey Heath Borough Council
- Tandridge District Council
- Waverley Borough Council
- Woking Borough Council

- (3) That the Regulatory Services Manager be authorised to undertake the Taxi and Private Hire enforcement powers referred to in paragraph (2) above.

Reason:

To improve safety within the licensed hackney carriage and private hire vehicle service operating in Surrey.

Comments:

None

12 SELECTION OF THE MAYOR AND THE DEPUTY MAYOR 2020-21 (Pages 143 – 146 of the Council agenda)

Notes:

- At its meeting on 26 November 2019, the Executive considered this matter and endorsed the recommendation contained in the report to Council in respect of the nomination of Councillor Marsha Moseley for the Mayoralty for the municipal year 2020-21.
- No nominations in respect of the appointment of the Deputy Mayor for the municipal year 2020-21 have been received. Any late nominations will be announced at the meeting.
- The Mayor to ask the nominees for Mayor and for the Deputy Mayor (if there is a late nomination) for 2020-21 to leave the Chamber for consideration of this item of business.

The motion:

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves, to propose, and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Fiona White to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley be nominated for the Mayoralty of the Borough for the 2020-21 municipal year.
- (2) That consideration of nominations for appointment of Deputy Mayor for the 2020-21 municipal year, be deferred to the meeting of the Council to be held on 5 February 2020.

Reason:

To make early preparations for the selection of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the 2020-21 municipal year.

Comments:

None

13 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Pages 147 - 152 of the Council agenda)

To receive and note the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 24 September 2019, which are attached to the Council agenda.

Comments:

None

14 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 26 SEPTEMBER 2019 – ENVIRONMENTAL AUDIT

Councillor Susan Parker to propose, and Councillor Dennis Booth to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“This Council resolves:

- (1) That an environmental audit of the impact of building on green fields be conducted by independent environmental experts.
- (2) That the objectives of that environmental audit should be to consider our carbon footprint in the context of new housing, and to determine the impact of reviewing site allocations to reallocate to the urban area.
- (3) That the terms of appointment be drafted by an all-party task group, in consultation with the CPRE and Surrey Wildlife Trust, and presented to full Council for approval.

- (4) That, pending that environmental audit, the Council will approach the Secretary of State, following the General Election, to request a temporary moratorium on approving planning applications for developments of more than 4 homes on green fields, or undeveloped land within Guildford borough.”

Comments:

None

Amendment

The Lead Councillor for Planning, Regeneration and Housing, Councillor Jan Harwood to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves to second the following amendment:

- (a) After “This Council resolves” add the following:

“to ask the Executive to consider the following action:”

- (b) Substitute the following in place of paragraph (3):

“(3) That the terms of appointment be drafted by an all-party task group, in consultation with the CPRE and Surrey Wildlife Trust, and presented to full Council for debate and comment, prior to final approval by the Executive”.

The motion, as amended, would therefore read as follows:

“This Council resolves to ask the Executive to consider the following action:

- (1) That an environmental audit of the impact of building on green fields be conducted by independent environmental experts.
- (2) That the objectives of that environmental audit should be to consider our carbon footprint in the context of new housing, and to determine the impact of reviewing site allocations to reallocate to the urban area.
- (3) That the terms of appointment be drafted by an all-party task group, in consultation with the CPRE and Surrey Wildlife Trust, and presented to full Council for debate and comment, prior to final approval by the Executive.
- (4) That, pending that environmental audit, the Council will approach the Secretary of State, following the General Election, to request a temporary moratorium on approving planning applications for developments of more than 4 homes on green fields, or undeveloped land within Guildford borough.”

15 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 21 NOVEMBER 2019: MODERN SLAVERY

Councillor James Walsh to propose, and Councillor Angela Gunning to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“Guildford Borough Council has embedded measures to address the evils of modern slavery in its safeguarding policy and procedures and we welcome this as an essential first step to tackling exploitation in Guildford. However, with the number of people estimated to have been coerced into modern slavery nationally increasing tenfold between 2013 and 2016 – from 13,000 to 136,000 – we believe that a more proactive approach now needs to be taken by this council, in line with the 50 others – including Surrey County Council – that have signed up to the Charter against Modern Slavery.

Collectively, councils across the UK spend £40bn per year on procuring services from hundreds of contractors and sub-contractors and they oversee large supply chains in all areas of their business. As public bodies, accountable to the public, they have a duty to ensure that those supply chains do not hide the sins and iniquities of exploitation.

The Charter against Modern Slavery

By signing the Charter against Modern Slavery, Guildford Borough Council commits to:

- (a) Train its corporate procurement team to understand modern slavery through the Chartered Institute of Procurement and Supply's (CIPS) online course on Ethical Procurement and Supply.
- (b) Require its contractors to comply fully with the Modern Slavery Act 2015, wherever it applies, with contract termination as a potential sanction for non-compliance.
- (c) Challenge any abnormally low-cost tenders to ensure they do not rely upon the potential contractor practising modern slavery.
- (d) Highlight to its suppliers that contracted workers are free to join a trade union and are not to be treated unfairly for belonging to one.
- (e) Publicise its whistle-blowing system for staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
- (f) Require its tendered contractors to adopt a whistle-blowing policy which enables their staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
- (g) Review its contractual spending regularly to identify any potential issues with modern slavery.
- (h) Highlight for its suppliers any risks identified concerning modern slavery and refer them to the relevant agencies to be addressed.
- (i) Refer for investigation via the National Crime Agency's national referral mechanism any of its contractors identified as a cause for concern regarding modern slavery.
- (j) Report publicly on the implementation of this policy annually.

Councils who sign this charter can access cost-free support through the Transparency in Supply Chains report (<https://tiscreport.org/>), an NGO that will monitor companies supplying the council in relation to their compliance with section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act 2015.

This Council resolves:

- (1) To sign the Charter Against Modern Slavery, which encompasses points (a) to (j) above, immediately to ensure that it does not inadvertently rely on exploitation and modern slavery in its use of suppliers.
- (2) To report back on progress to Full Council on an annual basis, one year from the date the Charter is signed and each year thereafter."

Alteration of Motion:

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor James Walsh as the mover of the original motion, has indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wishes to alter his motion in accordance with the proposed alteration below. The Mayor will put the proposed alteration to a vote without debate. If approved, Councillor Walsh's motion, as altered, will become the substantive motion for debate to which amendments may subsequently be moved.

Alteration

After “*This Council resolves*” add “*to ask the Leader of the Council:*”.

The resolution part of the motion, as altered, would therefore read as follows:

This Council resolves to ask the Leader of the Council:

- (1) To sign the Charter Against Modern Slavery, which encompasses points (a) to (j) above, immediately to ensure that it does not inadvertently rely on exploitation and modern slavery in its use of suppliers.
- (2) To report back on progress to Full Council on an annual basis, one year from the date the Charter is signed and each year thereafter.”

Comments:

None

16 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 22 NOVEMBER 2019: NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Councillor Christopher Barrass to propose, and Councillor Jan Harwood to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“The Council recognises that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has recently undergone a review. However, with the now declared Climate Emergency (subsequent to that review), and the widespread support of the principle of building on brownfield before greenfield sites wherever possible, the Council requests the Secretary of State to hold an immediate further review of the NPPF to:

- (1) Better define “sustainable development” in the light of the declared Climate Emergency.
- (2) Better assist with brownfield delivery by granting councils simple effective powers to bring forward currently, as well as previously, used sites.
- (3) Amend Paragraph 145 of the NPPF which is having the unintended consequences in Greenbelt areas of enabling unrestricted building of four bedroomed houses through ‘infilling’, yet at the same time preventing residents from having a simple extension or garage for their own home.”

Alteration of Motion:

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Christopher Barrass as the mover of the original motion, has indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wishes to alter his motion in accordance with the proposed alteration below. The Mayor will put the proposed alteration to a vote without debate. If approved, Councillor Barrass’ motion, as altered, will become the substantive motion for debate to which amendments may subsequently be moved.

Alteration

- (a) Substitute the following in place of the second sentence of the motion:

“However, with the now declared Climate Emergency (subsequent to that review), and the widespread support of the principle of building on brownfield before greenfield sites wherever possible, the Council *asks the Executive to request* the Secretary of State to hold an immediate further review of the NPPF *and its guidance* to:”

- (b) Substitute the following in place of item (1) of the list of matters regarding the NPPF suggested for review:

“(1) Recognise the declared Climate Emergency and provide more detailed guidance on creating “sustainable development” which takes into account the required actions on transport and development to meet Carbon Zero, for both brownfield and green field sites.”*

**NPPF – Paragraph 7 states: ‘the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’*

- (c) Substitute the following in place of item (3) of the list of matters regarding the NPPF suggested for review:

“(3) Amend Paragraph 145 of the NPPF – to correct the unintended consequences in Greenbelt areas of enabling unrestricted building of inappropriate houses through ‘infilling’, yet at the same time preventing residents from having a simple extension or garage for their own home.”

The motion, as altered, would therefore read as follows:

“The Council recognises that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has recently undergone a review. However, with the now declared Climate Emergency (subsequent to that review), and the widespread support of the principle of building on brownfield before greenfield sites wherever possible, the Council asks the Executive to request the Secretary of State to hold an immediate further review of the NPPF and its guidance to:

- (1) Recognise the declared Climate Emergency and provide more detailed guidance on creating “sustainable development”*, which takes into account the required actions on transport and development to meet Carbon Zero, for both brownfield and green field sites.
- (2) Better assist with brownfield delivery by granting councils simple effective powers to bring forward currently, as well as previously, used sites.
- (3) Amend Paragraph 145 of the NPPF – to correct the unintended consequences in Greenbelt areas of enabling unrestricted building of inappropriate houses through ‘infilling’, yet at the same time preventing residents from having a simple extension or garage for their own home.

**NPPF – Paragraph 7 states: ‘the objective of sustainable development can be summarised as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’*”

Comments:

None

17 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

The Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington to propose, and the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley 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 item 18 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Act”.

18 LEASE OF PROPERTY IN TOWN CENTRE (Pages 167 – 174 of the Council agenda)

Notes:

At its meeting on 26 November 2019, the Executive considered this matter and approved the principal terms of the proposed lease and the associated valuation fees, lettings fees and legal fees which are to be vired from the budget pressures reserve. The Executive also endorsed the recommendation contained in the report to the Council.

The motion:

The Lead Councillor for Finance and Assets, Customer Service, Councillor Joss Bigmore to propose and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Caroline Reeves to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“That the sum of £2.5 million be vired from the capital contingency fund in respect of the contribution towards the refurbishment and fees.

Reasons:

To complete the lease to secure a longer-term income stream and assist with the regeneration of this part of the town.”

Comments:

None

19 COMMON SEAL

To order the Common Seal.
