



**COUNCIL MEETING**

**TUESDAY, 7 DECEMBER 2021**

**ORDER PAPER**

**ORDER PAPER (Pages 1 - 18)**

This page is intentionally left blank



## COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY 7 DECEMBER 2021

### 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.

I would like to welcome everyone to this evening's meeting of the Council.

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 business on tonight's agenda. It also sets out details of any questions submitted by councillors together with 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 Marsha Moseley*  
*The Mayor of Guildford*

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

## 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

## 2 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

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

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

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

## 3 MINUTES (Pages 9 – 44 of the Council agenda)

To confirm the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council on 5 October and the extraordinary meeting held on 1 November 2021.

## 4. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

To receive any communications or announcements from the Mayor.

## 5. LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

In the absence of the Leader of the Council, the Deputy Leader to comment on the following matters:

- COVID update
- Changes to the Executive (see **Appendix 1** to the Order Paper)
- Christmas festivities
- Crowdfunding
- Walnut Bridge update (phase 1)
- City Bid update

Councillors shall have the opportunity of asking questions of the Deputy Leader in respect of the Leader's communications.

## 6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

### Statement:

Ivor Thomas (resident of Shalford) to make a statement in respect of Surrey County Council's proposals to convert Dagley Lane into a cycle track and to request Guildford Borough Council to raise an objection.

The Lead Councillor for Environment to respond.

## 7. PETITION: MAKE GUILDFORD PESTICIDE-FREE (Pages 45 – 72 of the Council Agenda)

### Petition:

The petition, containing 534 signatures, asks the Council to:

*“...phase out the use of pesticides, including glyphosate, in Guildford.”*

### Petition organisers' statement

The co-organisers of the petition Helen Harris and Frances Rollin, who are also members of the Guildford Environmental Forum, will be invited to make a statement to the Council in support of their petition.

The Mayor has agreed that Helen Harris and Frances Rollin may speak for three minutes each, followed by Nick Mole (Policy Officer, Pesticide Action Network UK), also for three minutes.

Following the statements, councillors will have the opportunity of asking the petition organisers any questions. The Council will then debate the petition.

### The debate

#### Proposed motion in response to this petition (see page 51 of the Council Agenda):

The Lead Councillor for Environment, Councillor James Steel to propose, and the Lead Councillor for Economy, Councillor John Redpath, to second the following motion in response to the petition:

*“This Council acknowledges the work that officers have already undertaken to minimise chemical use and to explore alternative methods of weed control. We also recognise that the current Chemical Minimisation Policy, whilst still relevant, needs review.*

*The Council aims to stop using chemicals and believes that the approach to be taken should be to phase out their use as quickly as is practicable, recognising that at present it may not always be possible to eliminate their use altogether.*

*The Council feels that a detailed chemical action plan should be developed that includes continued commitment to:*

- *existing chemical reduction actions*
- *exploring alternatives*
- *communication*
- *educating site users and managing expectations*
- *working with partners to facilitate alternative approaches*

*To that end, the Council therefore*

*RESOLVES: That the Executive be requested to urgently consider and approve the proposed chemical reduction measures in 2022 set out in Appendix 6 to the report submitted to the Council.” (pages 71 and 72 of the Council agenda)*

### Alteration of Motion:

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor James Steel, 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 Steel's motion, as

altered, will become the substantive motion for debate to which amendments may subsequently be moved.

**Alteration:**

- (1) Substitute the following in place of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the motion:

*“The Council aspires to becoming a pesticide and herbicide free borough (to the greatest extent possible), following an agreed three-year phase-out plan, and accordingly feels that a detailed chemical action plan should be developed that includes continued and public commitment to:*

- (2) Omit the fifth bullet point.

- (3) Add the following bullet points:

- *“establishing a working group involving partners including the Pesticides Action Network and the Guildford Environmental Forum to facilitate alternative approaches*
- *Collaborating on the phasing-out of pesticide use with Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council (who have already adopted a similar policy)*
- *Incorporating the Council’s chemical action plan in all relevant contracts.”*

The motion, as altered, would read as follows:

*“This Council acknowledges the work that officers have already undertaken to minimise chemical use and to explore alternative methods of weed control. We also recognise that the current Chemical Minimisation Policy, whilst still relevant, needs review.*

*The Council aims to stop using chemicals and believes that the approach to be taken should be to phase out their use as quickly as is practicable, recognising that at present it may not always be possible to eliminate their use altogether.*

*The Council aspires to becoming a pesticide and herbicide free borough (to the greatest extent possible), following an agreed three-year phase-out plan, and accordingly feels that a detailed chemical action plan should be developed that includes continued and public commitment to:*

- *existing chemical reduction actions*
- *exploring alternatives*
- *communication*
- *educating site users and managing expectations*
- *establishing a working group involving partners including the Pesticides Action Network and the Guildford Environmental Forum to facilitate alternative approaches*
- *Collaborating on the phasing-out of pesticide use with Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council (who have already adopted a similar policy)*
- *Incorporating the Council’s chemical action plan in all relevant contracts.*

*To that end, the Council therefore*

*RESOLVES: That the Executive be requested to urgently consider and approve the proposed chemical reduction measures in 2022 set out in Appendix 6 to the report submitted to the Council.” (pages 71 and 72 of the Council agenda)”*

Comments:

Councillor Catherine Young  
Councillor Tom Hunt

Petition organisers' right of reply

At the end of the debate and before the Council takes a vote on its response to the petition, the co-organisers of the petition have asked Nick Mole to exercise their right of reply for which he will be given a period of five minutes.

The vote

After the right of reply, the Council will take a vote on its response to the petition.

**8. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

There are no questions from councillors.

**9. REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION ON LOCAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES** (Pages 73 – 162 of the Council agenda)UpdatesDesign Codes:

Councillors will recall that, at the meeting of the Executive on 23 November 2021, officers were requested to conduct further investigation as to the merits of extending the (draft Policy D4(8)/(9)) requirement for design codes to all housing sites allocated in the Development Plan. The outcome of this work is set out in **Appendix 2** to this Order Paper.

Proposed changes to Parking Standards in draft LPDMP and draft Parking SPD:

See note attached as **Appendix 3** to this Order Paper

The motion:

As a consequence of the updates, the Lead Councillor for Regeneration, Councillor John Rigg to propose, and Councillor Liz Hogger to second the adoption of the following motion:

“(1) That the draft Local Plan: Development Management Policies document which accompanied the agenda for the extraordinary Council meeting held on 1 November, including the changes to that document referred to in Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved for Regulation 19 public consultation for a period of six-weeks beginning in early January 2022, subject to the following amendments:

- (i) Add the following wording to Policy D4

***‘Masterplanning and Design Codes***

*8) Strategic sites listed in LPSS 2019 Policy D1(13) are required to produce masterplans and follow a Design Code approach through the planning application process. This will require a Design Code to be agreed prior to the granting of full or reserved matters planning permission for any phase of the development. Where outline planning permission has been agreed subject to Design Code agreement, any relevant Reserved Matters applications which are submitted without the Design Code being agreed will be refused.*

*9) Masterplans and Design Codes will also be required for any site that will be developed in more than one phase or by more than one developer. Failure to agree a Design Code approach is likely to result in the refusal of an application.*

10) A design code will be required for any other site or part of a site where it is considered necessary to set design parameters’.

(ii) Add the following text to the reasoned justification to the policy:

*‘5.19 Masterplans and Design Codes will also be required on other sites as specified in the policy in order to deliver schemes that are designed in a comprehensive manner. This will ensure that matters such as the design and location of roads, cycle and pedestrian links, open space, services and facilities are all considered holistically across the wider site. It is also important that any development proposal considers the way in which it will knit into the existing settlement fabric, promoting interconnectedness and avoiding sterilising the future development potential of adjoining land. The need to set design parameters in design codes is most likely to be required where there is design uncertainty, such as in the case of outline or hybrid planning applications for development sites.’*

(iii) Amend the wording of the proposed LPDMP Policy ID11 at point e) so that it reads as follows:

*‘the provision of electric vehicle charging will provide at least the minimum requirements set out in the Parking SPD; and’*

(2) That the draft Parking Supplementary Planning Document, be approved for public consultation for a four-week period beginning in January 2022.

(3) That the Lead Councillor with portfolio responsibility for Planning Policy be authorised, in consultation with the Director of Strategic Services,

(a) to amend:

(i) the draft Parking SPD to include standards for Electric Vehicle Charge Points (EVCP) for strategic sites (alongside EVCP standards for non-strategic sites, which are already in the draft Parking SPD), and

(ii) the guidance within the draft Parking SPD to reflect the Government’s proposed new EVCP requirements for both strategic sites and non-strategic sites.

(b) to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the documents referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) above, as they may deem necessary.

(4) That if, in due course, and based on appropriate evidence, the Council wishes to introduce more stringent EVCP requirements, an updated Parking SPD be brought forward for consultation and potential adoption.

Reason:

The recommendations above are made to encourage the Council to:

- 1) Enable the draft Local Plan: Development Management Policies document to be published for public consultation.
- 2) Allow officers to undertake public consultation in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015, the National Planning Practice Guidance, and the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement 2020.

Undertaking a public consultation on the draft Local Plan is a statutory requirement placed on Local Planning Authorities under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local

Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 ('Local Planning Regulations') and will enable the Council to move closer to adopting the second part of the Local Plan as required by law and policy."

**Comments:**

Councillor Catherine Young

**10. GAMBLING ACT 2005: STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES 2022-25** (Pages 163 - 234 of the Council agenda)

The Lead Councillor for Environment, Councillor James Steel to propose, and the Chairman of the Licensing Committee, Councillor David Goodwin to second, the adoption of the following motion:

"That the draft Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles 2022-25, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

Reason:

To comply with the requirements of the Gambling Act 2005 the Council must prepare, consult on, and approve a statement of principles for the period 2022-25."

**Comments:**

None

**11. LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2022-23** (Pages 235 – 274 of the Council agenda)

The Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson to propose, and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane to second, the adoption of the following motion:

"(1) That the current Local Council Tax Support scheme (which is on the Council's website), be amended for 2022-23 as set out in detail in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, with effect from 1 April 2022.

(2) That the Council maintains a discretionary hardship fund of £40,000 in 2022-23, and carries forward any residual 2020 and 2021 COVID19 Council Tax Hardship Funds.

Reasons:

(1) To ensure that the Council complies with government legislation to implement a LCTS scheme from 1 April 2022.

(2) To maintain a discretionary fund to help applicants suffering from severe financial hardship."

**Comments:**

None

**12. APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL AUDITORS** (Pages 275 - 290 of the Council agenda)

The Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson to propose, and the Chairman of the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee, Councillor George Potter to second, the adoption of the following motion:

"That the Council accepts Public Sector Audit Appointments' invitation to opt in to the sector-led option for the appointment of external auditors to principal local government and police bodies for five financial years from 1 April 2023.

Reason:

To enable the Council to comply with statutory obligations under Section 7 of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014”.

**Comments:**

None

**13. REVIEW OF THE NUMERICAL ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES TO POLITICAL GROUPS: 2021-22** (Pages 291 – 302 of the Council agenda)

The Lead Councillor for Economy, Councillor John Redpath to propose, and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane to second, the adoption of the following motion:

“That the numerical allocation of seats on committees to each political group on the Council, as shown in Appendix 3 to the report submitted to the Council (page 301 of the Council agenda), be approved for the remainder of the 2021-22 municipal year.

Reason:

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

**Comments:**

None

**14. SELECTION OF THE MAYOR AND THE DEPUTY MAYOR 2022-23** (Pages 303 - 306 of the Council agenda)

Note:

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth, together with the nominee for the Deputy Mayor for 2022-23 (Councillor Masuk Miah) to leave the meeting for consideration of this item of business. They will be called back into the meeting after the Council has considered the matter.

As the Deputy Mayor will be chairing the meeting in the absence of the Mayor, it will be necessary to elect a non-Executive councillor to chair the meeting in respect of this item.

The motion:

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, to propose, and the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth be nominated for the Mayoralty of the Borough for the 2022-23 municipal year.
- (2) That Councillor Masuk Miah be nominated for the Deputy Mayoralty of the Borough for the 2022-23 municipal year.

Reason:

To make early preparations for the selection of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the municipal year 2022-23.

**Comments:**

None

**15. NOTICE OF MOTION A: ENDING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS** (pages 4 - 7 of the Council Agenda)

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor George Potter to propose, and the Deputy Leader, Councillor Julia McShane to second the following motion:

“Council notes that:

- i. Sexual violence, sexual harassment, and domestic abuse remain endemic in our society:
  - a. In 2019/20, 4.9 million women were victims of sexual assault in England and Wales, according to the Office for National Statistics (ONS).
  - b. A third of 16-18-year-old girls report experiencing unwanted sexual touching at school, according to End Violence Against Women.
- ii. The pandemic has made the situation worse:
  - a. The ONS report into Domestic abuse during the pandemic in November 2020 found increased demand for victim services and indicators that severity of abuse has increased.
  - b. Plan International UK found that since lockdown began, 1 in 5 girls aged 14-21 experienced public sexual harassment.
  - c. By 2030, 2 million more girls are now at risk of undergoing Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) due to the pandemic according to Plan International.
- iii. The justice system is failing many victims of domestic abuse and sexual violence:
  - a. Out of 139,000 rapes estimated by the ONS in the year ending March 2020, only 58,845 were reported to police. Of those, just 2.4% ended in convictions.
  - b. Three in four domestic abuse cases in England and Wales end without charge, according to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services.
- iv. Those from minority backgrounds experience domestic abuse disproportionately:
  - a. ONS figures for 2019 show that disabled women were more than twice as likely to experience domestic abuse than non-disabled women.
  - b. LGBT+ people are significantly more likely to experience domestic abuse, with 13 per cent of bisexual women facing intimate partner abuse in 2019/20, according to Stonewall.
  - c. In 2019, 60 per cent of UK police forces admitted referring victims of crime to the Home Office for immigration purposes, harming migrant women.
- v. The Domestic Abuse Act 2021, whilst very welcome, still contains policy gaps, including failure to provide equal protection for migrant women.
- vi. The funding for domestic abuse services in the 2021 Budget falls short of the figure that Women's Aid says is needed by over £200 million per year.
- vii. The UK has failed to ratify the Istanbul Convention, a treaty creating a global framework for protecting women from violence.

Council believes that:

- I. Everyone, regardless of identity, has the right to live a life free from fear and violence.
- II. Current systems and services do not properly tackle continuing violence against women and girls in our society due to underfunding, ingrained culture of victim blaming and lack of available education and training.

- III. Investing in raising awareness, education, and policies aimed at prevention is vital and prevents greater costs long-term.
- IV. An intersectional approach to violence against women and girls is imperative to provide high level care and support to the most vulnerable victims.
- V. Disclosures of abuse must be made easier and always taken seriously by authorities who offer a trauma-informed response.
- VI. Perpetrators of serious violence usually have a history of inflicting abuse and harassment against other women and girls. Tackling violence against women and girls means dismantling this culture.
- VII. Ending violence against women and girls must be a top priority for all levels of government.

Council resolves:

That the Executive be requested:

- A. To recognise misogyny as a hate crime.
- B. To find ways to help support members of our diverse communities who may need specialist care and help.
- C. To ensure that Guildford Borough Council continues to do everything in its power to build a borough free from misogyny and violence against women and girls. This includes continuing to invest in vital services, listening and responding to women and girls about the action needed, and calling out misogyny and sexism wherever we see or hear it.
- D. To work with Surrey Police on improving women's safety in Guildford borough.
- E. To continue to work with local and national networks working to end violence against women and girls
- F. To become a White Ribbon Accredited Organisation.  
<https://www.whiteribbon.org.uk/organisations>

Council calls on Surrey Police to:

- a. record harassment of women and girls as a hate crime as soon as possible, not wait until they are required to do so
- b. prioritise investigating crimes against women and girls and ask them to ensure that women and girls are treated with the required sensitivity.

Council calls on Surrey County Council to:

- a. encourage the teaching of age-appropriate education on consent from primary school.
- b. work with schools and families to tackle toxic masculinity culture, and to educate men through campaigns and bringing in male "allies".

Council calls on the Government to:

1. Increase efforts to prevent and detect violence against women and girls by:
  - a. Funding an NHS-style public awareness campaign as soon as possible, including on long-lasting trauma impacts.
  - b. Consulting education leaders and the specialist violence against women and girls sector, to take immediate action on sexual harassment in schools and higher education.
  - c. Implementing guidance to include awareness of public sexual harassment and its consequences in the national curriculum.
  - d. Upskilling all school staff via training to ensure confidence in correctly and sensitively handling disclosures of a sexual or abusive nature.
  - e. Introducing a duty on public authorities to ensure all frontline staff are trained to detect and respond appropriately to domestic abuse.

- f. Improving cross-government coordination of policies and services for separating families across England and Wales.
  - g. Establishing a plan to tackle the social recovery of vulnerable and at-risk women and girls following the pandemic.
  - h. Ensuring the child's safety and needs are put first when decisions are made as to the appropriate level of contact with an abusive parent.
2. Improve outcomes for victims of sexual violence and domestic abuse by:
- a. Ensuring migrant women have equal access to protection from abuse.
  - b. Introducing training and guidance for organisations on making their services more trans inclusive.
  - c. Offering a long-term funding model for specialist services, including specialist BAME and LGBT+ services, so they can plan strategically and fully focus on providing support.
  - d. Introducing mandatory training for police and the Crown Prosecution Service in understanding the impact of trauma on victims.
  - e. Improving access to independent legal support for victims, including those with no recourse to public funds.
  - f. Introducing mandatory awareness training for local authority Children's Services staff to enable them to appropriately examine and record allegations of domestic abuse which may present as parental conflict.
  - g. Ensuring appropriate support is available for those who do not flee from their abuser.
  - h. Giving Local Authorities the duty and funding to provide appropriate accommodation and support for survivors of abuse
3. Strengthen the justice system to properly deal with sexual violence and domestic abuse by:
- a. Urgently increasing funding to reduce Criminal and Family court backlogs.
  - b. Extending protections of 16 and 17-year-olds by expanding the definition of 'position of trust', to include all adults who work/volunteer with under-18s.
  - c. Legislating to make public sexual harassment a criminal offence.
  - d. Legislating to make the promotion of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) a hate crime.
4. Establish the UK as a leader in domestic and global efforts to end violence against women and girls by:
- a. Ratifying the Istanbul Convention as soon as possible.
  - b. Setting up an independent commission on 'Ending Violence Against Women and Girls' for ongoing, sustainable accountability and progress in domestic and global efforts."

**Comments:**

None

**16. NOTICE OF MOTION B: PENSION FUND DIVESTMENT FROM FOSSIL FUELS**  
(pages 7 - 8 of the Council Agenda)

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Steven Lee to propose, and Councillor Cait Taylor to second the following motion:

"Council recognises that burning fossil fuels contributes significantly to global warming. Research demonstrates that 80% or more of the world's fossil fuel reserves will have to remain unburnt if we are to meet targets for climate change mitigation. As four-fifths of known fossil fuels must remain in the ground investing in them now presents a substantial financial and environmental risk. Council notes the International Energy

Agency has released modelling in 2021 predicting that global oil demand could peak as early as 2025, and that its Executive Director has referred to putting money into oil and gas projects as being potential 'junk investments'.

Guildford Borough Council is a member of the Surrey Pension Fund, which currently has £108 million invested in fossil fuel through its Local Government Pension Fund Scheme.

Council believes that this investment is both environmentally and financially irresponsible. Every indication points to renewable energies and green technologies being much safer investments for pension funds going forwards. With COP 26 having taken place in Glasgow the world's eyes are on the UK to show leadership on climate change. Divesting from fossil fuels in our pension fund is a clear and meaningful action we can take here in Surrey.

Council recognises that fossil fuel investments should be considered part of the council's 'carbon footprint' and that divesting our pension fund is one of the most impactful steps we can take to reduce our impact on our community and the world.

Council therefore commits to:

- Ensuring our own Investment Strategy rules out new investments in fossil fuel companies.
- Calling on the Surrey Pension Fund to divest from fossil fuels by requesting the Pension Fund Committee to adopt and implement responsible investment policies which:
  - a. Immediately freeze any new investment in the top 200 publicly-traded fossil fuel companies.
  - b. Divest from direct ownership and any commingled funds that include fossil fuel public equities and corporate bonds by 2030.
  - c. Set out an approach to quantify and address climate change risks affecting all other investments.
  - d. Actively seek to invest in companies that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and minimise climate risk.
  - e. Ensure that the overall investment portfolio is aligned with the Paris Agreement's goal of limiting global warming to 1.5°C.
- Council further instructs the Joint Chief Executive to write to the Leaders and Chief Executives of all other councils that use the Surrey Pension Fund outlining this Council's position and asking for their support to adopt the same policies".

**Comments:**

None

**17. MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE** (Pages 307 – 324 of the Council agenda)

To receive and note the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 24 August, 21 September, and 26 October 2021, which are attached to the Council agenda.

**Comments:**

None

**18. COMMON SEAL**

To order the Common Seal.

## Appendix 1

## CHANGES TO THE EXECUTIVE

Councillor	Areas of Responsibility
<b>Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Service Delivery</b> Councillor Joss Bigmore	<del>Customer Service</del> , Governance including corporate Health and Safety, <del>Future Guildford Guildford/Waverley partnership</del> , <del>Human Resources</del> , Partnerships, <del>Web Services</del> , Corporate Strategy, and <del>Communications</del> <del>Climate Change</del> , Innovation, Strategic Planning, <del>Sustainable Transport</del> , <del>Housing Delivery</del> , <del>Air Quality</del>
<b>Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Community and Housing</b> Councillor Julia McShane	Health, Wellbeing, Access and Disability, Safety, grants and voluntary services, Careline, Handyperson, Care and Repair, Housing, Homelessness, housing standards (HMOs, private rented sector), <del>Human Resources</del>
<b>Lead Councillor for Resources</b> Councillor Tim Anderson	Finance, Commercial Asset Management, Procurement, <del>Communications</del>
<b>Lead Councillor for Development Management</b> Councillor Tom Hunt	Development Control and Enforcement.
<b>Lead Councillor for Economy</b> Councillor John Redpath	Economic Development, Social Enterprise, Rural Economy, Heritage and Community Assets, <del>Customer Service including Web Services</del> .
<b>Lead Councillor for Regeneration</b> Councillor John Rigg	Town Centre MasterPlan, Infrastructure, Major Projects, Strategic Asset Management
<b>Lead Councillor for Environment</b> Councillor James Steel	Waste, Licensing (including Health and Safety regulation), Parking, Parks and Leisure, Arts and Tourism, Bereavement, Environmental Health and Protection.
<b><u>Lead Councillor for Climate Change</u></b> <u>Councillor Cait Taylor</u>	<u>Climate Change</u> , <u>Air Quality</u> , <u>Innovation</u> , <u>Sustainable Transport (tbc)</u>

## REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION ON LOCAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

### Outcome of the investigation as to the merits of extending the requirement for design codes to all housing sites allocated in the Development Plan

At the Executive meeting on 23 November 2021, officers were requested to conduct further investigation as to the merits of extending the (draft Policy D4(8)/(9)) requirement for design codes<sup>1</sup> to all housing sites allocated in the Development Plan.

In this regard, it is considered that there is insufficient justification for a blanket extension of the requirement in this manner. To do so would not align with the rationale for design codes (and masterplans) under previous and current Government guidance and could be regarded as superfluous in many instances.

Design codes (with masterplans) for sites are intended to set design parameters and are used to inform future design and mitigate risks associated with uncertainty such as when agreeing the broader principles of how a site may be developed at outline stage (without key design elements agreed). The need for a requirement for coding is, in this context, not generally evident when dealing with housing sites that are not strategic sites, nor developed in more than one phase or by more than one developer.

For these sites, planning applications tend to address the detailed design of the site comprehensively and at the same time. This reflects a 'full planning application' including matters that would only generally be fixed at later 'reserved matters' for outline (or hybrid) permissions. These full design aspects are reflected as part of the design and access statement for the site. The need for a further design code to control future design is then superfluous as there is little or no uncertainty between the grant of full permission and site build out. The details of the design are before the decision maker, and design parameters can be controlled including through the use of planning conditions.

However, it is acknowledged that there may be exceptions where 'smaller' or apparently less complex sites may reflect part of the site that is not resolved in design terms – this is most likely where there may be a self-build/custom build element to the site (although the Local Plan requirement for self-build/custom build provision is only reached at 100 home schemes). Whilst it is considered that current draft Policy paragraph 9) would enable the Council to require a design code to address this uncertainty, in order to provide further policy clarity, officers consider that wording could be added to Policy D4 as follows:

***'Masterplanning and Design Codes***

*8) Strategic sites listed in LPSS 2019 Policy D1(13) are required to produce masterplans and follow a Design Code approach through the planning application process. This will require a Design Code to be agreed prior to the granting of full or reserved matters planning permission for any phase of the development. Where outline planning permission has been agreed subject to Design Code agreement, any relevant Reserved Matters applications which are submitted without the Design Code being agreed will be refused.*

---

<sup>1</sup> The NPPF (2021) defines a design code as 'A set of illustrated design requirements that provide specific, detailed parameters for the physical development of a site or area. The graphic and written components of the code should build upon a design vision, such as a masterplan or other design and development framework for a site or area.'

9) *Masterplans and Design Codes will also be required for any site that will be developed in more than one phase or by more than one developer. Failure to agree a Design Code approach is likely to result in the refusal of an application.'*  
10) A design code will be required for any other site or part of a site where it is considered necessary to set design parameters.

An addition of text to the reasoned justification to the policy is proposed as follows:

*5.19 Masterplans and Design Codes will also be required on other sites as specified in the policy in order to deliver schemes that are designed in a comprehensive manner. This will ensure that matters such as the design and location of roads, cycle and pedestrian links, open space, services and facilities are all considered holistically across the wider site. It is also important that any development proposal considers the way in which it will knit into the existing settlement fabric, promoting interconnectedness and avoiding sterilising the future development potential of adjoining land. The need to set design parameters in design codes is most likely to be required where there is design uncertainty, such as in the case of outline or hybrid planning applications for development sites.*

**REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION ON  
LOCAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES  
AND CONSULTATION OF DRAFT PARKING SPD**

**Note on proposed changes to Parking Standards in draft LPDMP and draft Parking SPD**

Draft Policy ID11 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) and the draft Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) set out standards for the delivery of Electric Vehicle Charge Points (EVCP). These standards were prepared in 2019 for the Regulation 18 'Issues, Options and Preferred Options' consultation and were based on Surrey County Council's Vehicular and Cycle Parking Standards (2018) but amended to provide a stronger standard in respect of new flats with allocated parking spaces.

Whilst the Department for Transport and the Office for Low Emission Vehicles consulted on proposals for 'Electric vehicle charge points in residential and non-residential buildings' in July 2019, it was considered that as consultation proposals they were not suitably advanced as to be mirrored for GBC's parking standards. The Government have recently released [their response](#) to that consultation – 'Consultation Response: EV Charge points in Residential and Non-residential Buildings' (DfT, November 2021) – and the final EVCP requirements are planned to be implemented via Building Regulations. The Government intends to lay the implementing regulations in Parliament in 2021.

At present, the Guildford borough Local Development Scheme sets out a timetable for the 'Pre-submission publication and consultation (six weeks) (Regulation 19)' in January – February 2022, with 'Submission to the planning inspectorate for Examination (Regulation 22)' in May/June 2022 with anticipated adoption (Regulation 26) in March 2023.

Given the imminent national changes and the potential for further changes to EVCP requirements, in response to the Government's Net Zero commitment, we propose to amend the approach to the inclusion of EVCP standards in local policy.

Currently, the policy direction for parking standards is set out in the draft policy ID11 in the LPDMP, with the numerical standards for the strategic sites set out in an appendix to the LPDMP and with numerical standards for non-strategic sites contained within the draft Parking SPD. The rationale for setting out the numerical standards for non-strategic sites in the Parking SPD was to enable flexibility for future update. It is now considered that given the rapid evolution of the Government's ambitions and requirements relating to EVCP as described above, and also the potential for further change over the plan period, it would be undesirable to have the EVCP numerical standards for the strategic sites contained within policy, where they could become out of date quickly.

Therefore, it is proposed:

- (a) That the wording of the proposed LPDMP Policy ID11 at point e) be amended so that it reads as follows:

*'the provision of electric vehicle charging will provide at least the minimum requirements set out in the Parking SPD; and'*

- (b) That the Lead Councillor with portfolio responsibility for Planning Policy be authorised, in consultation with the Director of Strategic Services, to amend:
- (i) the draft Parking SPD to include standards for EVCPs for strategic sites (alongside EVCP standards for non-strategic sites, which are already in the draft Parking SPD), and

- (ii) the guidance within the draft Parking SPD to reflect the Government's proposed new EVCP requirements for both strategic sites and non-strategic sites.
- (c) That if, in due course, and based on appropriate evidence, the Council wishes to introduce more stringent EVCP requirements, an updated Parking SPD be brought forward for consultation and potential adoption.

This page is intentionally left blank