

COUNCIL MEETING
TUESDAY, 28 JULY 2020

ORDER PAPER (Pages 1 - 12)

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY 28 JULY 2020

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, which we are holding remotely as permitted under new Regulations due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic and government guidance. The Council has therefore made arrangements, following the change in the law, to hold the meeting virtually via Microsoft Teams, which is being streamed live and recorded and will be available for repeated viewing afterwards for up to 180 days from the date of this meeting.

If members of the public do not have an internet connection or access to a computer, they will be able to dial into the meeting and hear the proceedings but will not be able to participate, unless they have registered to speak. A message has been posted on the website in this regard. For public speakers, by participating virtually in the meeting you are consenting to being filmed and recorded, and the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and / or training purposes.

I should be grateful if participants in this meeting would ensure that:

- your cameras and microphones are turned off at all times unless you are speaking during the meeting
- your mobile phones and other hand-held devices are switched to silent during the duration of the meeting
- you minimise background distractions

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 Richard Billington
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

Note: Where it is necessary to conduct a vote by roll call, the name of each councillor present and eligible to vote will be read out in a random order rather than alphabetically by initial letter of surname.

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 5 – 26 of the Council agenda)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 5 May 2020 and the Selection Meeting held on 19 May 2020.

4 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

To receive any communications or announcements from the Mayor.

5 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

COVID-19

The Leader to make a statement to the Council on our ongoing response to the COVID-19 pandemic, and in particular the support we have provided to date to our local communities and businesses. The Leader will refer to the following statistical information:

- 17,299 telephone calls made to our most vulnerable shielded residents (Category A)
- 5,679 telephone calls made to other vulnerable residents (Categories B and C)
- 3,679 telephone calls received by our vulnerable people helpline
- 3,128 telephone calls received by Housing Advice Services
- 3,239 food parcel deliveries to our residents

- 2,327 food parcels delivered countywide from Guildford Spectrum

(No longer being delivered from Guildford Spectrum)

- 23,038 meals on wheels delivered
- 569 prescriptions collected and delivered to GBC residents
- 458 urgent minor home adaptations completed to keep elderly and vulnerable residents safe
- 46,186 information leaflets delivered to households by staff and volunteers

(Leaflets no longer being delivered)

- 70 homeless people placed in accommodation
- 89,186 web page views on coronavirus section of the GBC website
- 197,681 engagements with social media activity
- 61 commercial tenants most affected by the pandemic have been offered a change to their rent instalment dates.
- 87 staff redeployed to welfare hubs (food parcels, deliveries, meals on wheels and leaflets) and vulnerable persons helpline
- 1,585 grants paid to local businesses totalling £21,315,000

(A further 95 discretionary grants have been paid to local business totalling £1,111,250)

- 52 donations to the appeal to fund food parcels totalling £960.87
- 114 incoming calls from volunteers wanting to help
- 766 cremations at Guildford Crematorium
- 6,180 weekly visitors to Riverside Park (4,307 in 2019)

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

6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

7 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- (a) **Councillor Paul Spooner** to ask the Lead Councillor for Environment, Councillor James Steel, the following question:

“On 20 July 2020, Councillor James Steel in a Guildford Lib Dems Press Release stated that he was pleased to announce a project to decolonise Guildford Borough Council’s historic collections. He referenced a strategy timespan of 2020-2024 and stated that this was the top priority for GBC Heritage service to achieve over that period.

The stated process (apparently after discussion and agreement with the GBC leadership) is to:

- 1) Look at where each item came from
- 2) How each item was obtained
- 3) Whether the item should be sent back to place of origin to be displayed in their museums
- 4) For what remains after 3), write ups within the context of Britain’s colonial history

The reason for the decision to decolonise the collection is given as being 'coupled' with the Black Lives Matter movement.

I therefore ask the Lead Councillor for Environment:

- (1) why he believes that he has a mandate for decolonising the Guildford collection without any discussion within the wider Council, any motion or policy being presented at Executive or to Full Council
- (2) why no consultation has taken place to affirm that this is the will of the wider community
- (3) confirmation that the leadership at GBC are now 'coupled' with the Black Lives Movement and advise the Council what the partnership means, what are the desired outcomes for the whole community and whether Black Lives Matter takes precedence over All Lives Matter in this context?
- (4) An explanation as to how the Leadership team are going to define 'colonisation' in relation to history?"

The Lead Councillor's response is as follows:

- "(1) The Heritage Service has put together an ambitious action plan 'Heritage Forward Plan' which is required by the Arts Council to ensure we have an accredited museum and embed best practice in managing our museum in which decolonisation is one of those action points. Decolonisation is a contemporary museum issue and one that all museums are now being asked to address. New guidance is currently being written by sector bodies such as the Museums Association to support museums in tackling this issue. In September 2019, a delegation was agreed by the Executive to the Director of Environment in consultation with myself to sign off the forward plan which was due to be submitted in April 2020; however, the Arts Council has delayed this by a year due to Covid. However, given the range of actions which the service wishes to conduct and my wish to have this on public display, the forward plan will be coming to the Executive for discussion and approval at some point in the Autumn as well as other matters in relation to the museum especially the NHLF withdrawing all funding bids across the country (apologies if this was not made clear in my article and has hence been corrected).
- (2) We will be talking to and consulting with relevant museum and heritage stakeholders such as the Council's own Museum Working Group, the Heritage Forum and Friends of Guildford Museum on the Heritage Forward Plan in due course. On a national scale we would be following the guidance of the Arts Council England, the Museums Association, and other professional organisations. The Museums Association is drawing up decolonisation guidance and checklists for museums to follow. The cultural and heritage sector is now taking the issue of decolonisation very seriously and we may find that when funding bodies such as NLHF and ACE relaunch their funding streams post Covid, that there is an emphasis on projects that address decolonisation and democratisation of collections. Therefore, we would put ourselves in a good position for future fundraising by being proactive on this matter. We are aware of some work that has been done in the past (2007) by the service in checking connections to our colonial past; however, we should not remain complacent about the matter and we need to reach out to minority groups as part of the process of displaying the various narratives objects can tell.
- (3) I will take this question and answer in two parts. First there seems to be a misunderstanding on the term 'coupled' in relation to my article. The term was used to bring together sources of information, in this instance the murder of George Floyd, the protests happening throughout Western society and the Black

Lives Matter movement. It was not a reference to a coupling of organisations such as the 'coupling' Guildford has with Freiburg. Decolonisation practice in museums has been happening for a couple of years now and the action to 'decolonise' the collections was in the Forward Plan before the Black Lives Matter protests. The public response to the recent Black Lives Matter protests has been a catalyst to push decolonisation up the agenda.

Second, I find it troubling that the leader of the Conservative Independent Group would want to push the term 'All Lives Matter'. The usage of this type of language is incredibly dangerous as it completely dismisses the persecution and discrimination faced by ethnic minorities within and outside the borough of Guildford on a daily basis. I must add that I'm a straight white man and do not speak on behalf of the ethnic minorities of Guildford or beyond.

- (4) I fail to see the connection between the Executive's view on what is meant by colonisation and the work that will be conducted. Defining decolonisation is a matter of international debate and discussion and we will take our lead from professional bodies.

Decolonisation as a framework for re-evaluation of museum collections, has only recently entered contemporary museum practice, with the recent think piece by the Museums Association entitled 'Empowering Collections' recommending "a proactive approach to the democratisation and decolonisation of museums (Museums Association, 2019)." Case studies of decolonisation in museum practice have tended to focus on ethnographic collections; however, it is a useful framework to reflect on any group of people considered 'other' to the dominant narrative.

For a museum without ethnographic collections (such as Guildford museum) the process of democratisation and decolonisation would involve recognising potential and unconscious bias in the collections and then seeking evidence, objects and testimonies that tell alternative narratives. These might include histories of people with disabilities, women, working class people, people who identify as LGBTQ or people with BAME heritage.

The Forward Plan states an aspiration to decolonise the collections but the process is yet to be defined. It is likely that we will start by creating a decolonisation strategy or policy, linked to a research strategy, and based on museum sector best practice guidance. Decolonisation is likely to be an ongoing process that will happen via a series of smaller research projects. These will include consultation and collaboration with stakeholders and communities and may result in an exhibition or redisplay of a section of the museum.

Executive approval could be considered for any items that it might be felt should be repatriated or subject to restitution. There are strict guidelines and practice regarding the process for disposal, including for repatriation. Any objects proposed for repatriation would be subject to the policies and processes set out in the museum's Collections Development Policy. Ethical guidance on disposal including repatriation is provided by the Museums Association Code of Ethics."

Councillor James Steel
Lead Councillor for Environment

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

“Does the Council Leader agree that proposals to create a single, Surrey-wide unitary authority are incompatible with the principles of localism and could jeopardise our excellent COVID-19 response and public services? Will she agree to urgently investigate alternative options for unitary authorities, and the timing of a reorganisation, that may be more advantageous to our residents and our borough?”

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

“At our regular Surrey Leaders meeting on 17 July we discussed the proposal by Surrey County Council to create a single unitary authority, outlined in an email each leader received on Tuesday 14 July. There was agreement that it was very unfortunate that the leader of Surrey County Council did not consult with any of the borough and district leaders before announcing the plan, in spite of having explained it to all the Surrey MPs.

The general opinion of the borough and district leaders was that a single unitary authority would be too large and would have a detrimental impact on the social cohesion of the communities within each of the boroughs and districts. Furthermore, the poor timing of the SCC proposals takes the focus away from the need to ensure that we continue to work in partnership with SCC and others to support our communities and businesses in recovering from the devastating effects of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The majority of Borough and District Leaders agreed to send a letter to the Secretary of State to voice our concern, and that leaders and the relevant chief executives would work together to put forward alternative proposals. A copy of the letter is appended to this Order Paper. A contribution of £10,000 from each authority was suggested by the relevant leaders as an appropriate contribution from each relevant authority to commission the work looking at this further. The final amounts, and the scale of the required work, is still under consideration but it would still be preferable if Surrey County Council could work with us and be open to exploring further options.

I understand that not all councillors at this authority disagree with the approach of a single unitary, however the majority do favour a unitary arrangement (more than one unitary council in the county) to replace Surrey County Council and the 11 boroughs and districts. We have heard some suggested timescales coming out of Surrey County Council (that do need to be confirmed by SCC) with submission of a full business case/proposal in September 2020, ‘consult’ November/December 2020, shadow councils in April/May 2021 and implement in 2022.

The key concern is there has been no consultation with us, and it leaves very little time for the relevant Boroughs and Districts to work up agreed alternative proposals for the Government to consider. My suggestion is that when the government White Paper has been published, we convene an extraordinary council meeting to discuss the way forward, if there is one.

As you all know, County Council elections are planned for May 2021 and we need to have some guidance about whether this process will be affected by this unitary discussion. I will update Councillors as soon as I know. Whilst we all understand the arguments about efficiency and clarity in relation to the unitary agenda generally, the omission of consultation with us, and the residents and businesses who will be most impacted, indicates a total lack of respect for local democracy and has not assisted in allowing balanced and inclusive discussion”.

Councillor Caroline Reeves
Leader of the Council

8 REVIEW OF ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES: 2020-21 (Pages 27 – 42 of the Council agenda)

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

- (1) That, in the light of the vacancy in the Send ward caused by the death of Councillor Patrick Sheard and the postponement of any by-election to fill that vacancy until 6 May 2021, no changes be made to the Guildford Greenbelt Group's current allocation of seats on committees for the 2020-21 municipal year as agreed by the Council on 19 May 2020 and shown in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council.

[NB. A separate vote will be taken in respect of paragraph (1) above. For paragraph (1) to take effect, it would need to be carried with no councillor voting against]

If paragraph (1) is carried with NO dissent, the Council will vote on paragraph (2) below:

- (2) That, in the light of the constitution of the new Conservative Independent Group, the proposed numerical allocation of seats on committees for the remainder of the 2020-21 Municipal Year, as shown as Option 1 in Appendix 3 to the report submitted to the Council, be adopted.

If there are any dissenting councillors in respect of the vote on paragraph (1), the Council will vote on paragraph (3) below:

- (3) That, in the light of the vacancy in the Send ward and the constitution of the new Conservative Independent Group, the proposed numerical allocation of seats on committees for the remainder of the 2020-21 Municipal Year, as shown as Option 2 in Appendix 4 to the report submitted to the Council, be adopted.

[NB. For paragraphs (2) or (3) to take effect, a simple majority of councillors voting would be required]

Comments:

None

Amendment

Councillor Nigel Manning to propose, and Councillor Marsha Moseley to second, the following amendment:

To amend the proposed allocation of seats in Options 1 and 2 between the Conservative Group and Conservative Independent Group as follows:

- on the Community EAB, so that both the Conservative Group and the Conservative Independent Group have one seat each; and
- on the Planning Committee, so that the Conservative Group has two seats and the Conservative Independent Group has one seat.

[NB. A simple majority of councillors voting would be required for the amendment to be carried]

The debate on the motion and amendment: Procedural note

- (a) The Mayor to ask Councillor Bigmore to propose, and Councillor Reeves to second, the motion.
- (b) Council debates the motion.
- (c) Before a vote is taken on the motion, the Mayor to ask Councillor Manning to propose, and Councillor Moseley to second, the amendment.
- (d) Council debates the amendment.
- (e) The Mayor to ask Councillor Bigmore (as proposer of the original motion) if he wishes to exercise his right of reply on the amendment.
- (f) The Mayor to ask Councillor Manning (as proposer of the amendment) if he wishes to exercise his right of reply on the amendment.
- (g) Council votes on the amendment (simple majority required).

If the amendment is LOST,

- (h) The Mayor to ask Councillor Bigmore (as proposer of the original motion) if he wishes to exercise his right of reply on the debate on the motion.
- (i) Council to vote on original motion, i.e. a separate vote on paragraph (1) of the motion – which will require no dissenting councillors to be carried, and then a separate vote on paragraph (2) of the motion– which will require only a simple majority. If paragraph (1) is not carried, the Council will vote on paragraph (3) of the motion, which will require only a simple majority.

If the amendment is CARRIED,

- (j) The Mayor to ask Councillor Bigmore (as proposer of the original motion) if he wishes to exercise his right of reply on the debate on the motion, as amended.
- (k) Council to vote on motion, as amended, i.e. a separate vote on paragraph (1) of the motion – which will require no dissenting councillors to be carried, and then a separate vote on paragraph (2) of the motion with the changes proposed in the amendment being applied – which will require only a simple majority. If paragraph (1) is not carried, the Council will vote on paragraph (3) of the motion again with the changes proposed in the amendment being applied, which will require only a simple majority.

9 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE 2020-21 (Page 4 of the Council agenda)

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 29 (a), the Council will elect the vice-chairman of the Planning Committee for the remainder of the 2020-21 municipal year. The only nomination received was Councillor Colin Cross.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore to propose, and Councillor John Rigg to second the adoption of the following motion:

That the nomination of Councillor Colin Cross for election as vice-chairman of the Planning Committee for the remainder of the 2020-21 municipal year, be approved.

Comments:

None

10 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2019-20 (Pages 43 – 54 of the Council agenda)

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Paul Spooner to propose, and the Vice-Chairman of that Committee, Councillor James Walsh to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the report be commended as the annual report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2019-20.
- (2) That the current rules relating to call in and urgency provisions remain unchanged.

Comments:

None

11 CORPORATE MANAGEMENT TEAM PAY AWARD 2020-21 (Pages 55 – 58 of the Council agenda)

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

That a pay award of 2% be approved for the Managing Director and the Director posts with effect from 1 July 2020 in accordance with the Council's adopted Pay Policy Statement.

Comments:

None

12 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 10 JULY 2020: REVISED COLLECTION OF COUNCIL TAX ARREARS GOOD PRACTICE PROTOCOL (Pages 59 – 68 of the Council agenda)

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Angela Gunning to propose, and Councillor James Walsh to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“At a time of increasing financial pressure and rising unemployment, it is important that safeguards are in place to protect and support residents facing the possibility of falling into debt.

The inability to pay council tax is something that can affect us all: from residents dealing with the stress and uncertainty of not being able to pay their bills, to councils increasingly dependent on local income following a decade of central government cuts.

The Citizens' Advice Bureau has worked with the Local Government Association to create a “Revised Collection of Council Tax Arrears Good Practice Protocol” which calls for councils to improve existing practices for offering advice, support and payment options for residents facing difficulties in paying their council tax. A copy is attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council.

While Guildford Borough Council has a good record in the collection of council tax arrears, the Labour Group believes that adopting the protocol will strengthen the process by linking debt advice to repayment schemes and enabling early intervention before a crisis point is reached. This will benefit both our residents and the council, which is under increasing pressure to collect as much income as possible to support local services.

To date, 61 councils of all political stripes across England have already adopted the policy and the Labour Group calls on Guildford Borough Council to adopt the protocol as soon as is practical.

This Council resolves to request the Executive:

- (1) To adopt the CAB/LGA “Revised Collection of Council Tax Arrears Good Practice Protocol” as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council.
- (2) To authorise the Director of Resources to report back to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the impact of the protocol on council tax collection rates and customer satisfaction one year following its implementation”.

Comments:

Councillor Tim Anderson

Amendment

Councillor George Potter to propose, and Councillor Will Salmon to second, the following amendment:

Delete everything from the end of 'This Council resolves to request the Executive' onwards and insert:

“To authorise the Director of Resources to review the CAB/LGA “Revised Collection of Council Tax Arrears Good Practice Protocol” as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council and to report back to the relevant EAB with details as to where the Council's current approach differs from the CAB/LGA protocol in order to enable a recommendation on the protocol to be made by the EAB.”

13 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Pages 69 – 78 of the Council agenda)

To receive and note the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 21 April, 26 May, and 23 June 2020, which are attached to the Council agenda.

Comments:

None

14. COMMON SEAL

To order the Common Seal.

My Ref: NP/mch

23rd July 2020

Rt. Hon Robert Jenrick MP
Secretary of State for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Dear Secretary of State,

DEVOLUTION AND RECOVERY BILL

It is the stated intention of the Government to publish a White Paper and draft Bill on Devolution and Recovery from COVID in the early Autumn of 2020. District and Borough Councils in Surrey are aware of a letter sent to you by Councillor Tim Oliver, setting out the County Council's perspective on unitary government. This letter sets out the collective view of District and Boroughs at this stage of the debate.

There is a commitment by Surrey Boroughs and District councils to consider the merits of unitary government and a view that this represents a potential way forward. There are a number of principles however that need to underpin any future models for local government in Surrey and we believe it is essential that multi unitary models are fully analysed before any conclusions are drawn about the structure of potential unitary authorities in Surrey. Those principles include: -

- Delivery of place based local government which empowers local people to take more control over their local communities and enables swift, transparent decision making.
- Provision of value for money and efficient ways of using public resources as effectively as possible. This includes considering how demand led services such as adult care and children's services should be provided in the future.
- Creation of a structure and culture which encourages multi-agency working, sharing of strategies and budgets and makes optimum use of our collective resources.
- Facilitation of clear communication and negotiation channels between Surrey authorities and central government. In that respect, if a unitary structure were to be implemented, there could also be a form of combined authority where the collective views of one or more unitary authorities on priorities for economic growth and infrastructure can be articulated. The precise nature of this structure needs detailed analysis and discussion.
- The importance of retaining the representative and democratic basis of local government's relationship with its residents.

The Government has indicated that as a optimum guideline, unitary authorities should represent populations of between 300,000 and 500,000 people per administration. A single unitary authority for Surrey would represent 1.2m people and this would be equivalent to only the larger of metropolitan areas but without the clear sense of locality recognisable to residents

across a vastly different geographical spread. Further to this, it would be the largest unitary in England. This is one of the reasons why it is so necessary to evaluate other options which may represent localities (and the characteristics of Surrey communities) more appropriately.

However, please be assured of our commitment to work quickly in seeking a preferred structure. Until a robust evidence base and options appraisal is available, we would urge you to retain an open mind as to the future shape of local government in Surrey. We ask that if minded to invite a submission from Surrey County Council, you also invite a business cases submission for alternative models from the combined Districts and Boroughs grouping of Surrey for the future of local government in Surrey.

Only in this way can you be reassured that any decision about local government reorganisation in Surrey also safeguards the wellbeing of our residents, maximises the future transformation of the area, and secures its contribution to national prosperity.

Yours sincerely,

Cllr. Nick Prescott
Leader, Runnymede Borough Council
Chairman, Surrey Leaders

Cllr. Caroline Reeves
Leader, Guildford Borough Council

Cllr Stuart Selleck
Leader, Elmbridge Borough Council
Deputy Chairman, Surrey Leaders

Cllr. John Ward
Leader, Waverley Borough Council

Cllr Alan McClafferty
Leader, Surrey Heath Borough Council

Cllr. Stephen Cooksey
Leader, Mole Valley District Council

Cllr. David Bittleston
Leader, Woking Borough Council

Cllr. Clive Smitheram
Leader, Epsom and Ewell Borough Council

Cllr. John Boughtflower
Leader, Spelthorne Borough Council

Cllr. Mark Brunt
Leader, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council

Cllr. Tony Elias
Leader, Tanridge District Council