



GUILDFORD
B O R O U G H

EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 22 MARCH 2023

ORDER PAPER

ORDER PAPER (Pages 1 - 18)

This page is intentionally left blank



EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

WEDNESDAY 22 MARCH 2023

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 extraordinary 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 Dennis Booth
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 5 - 34 of the Council agenda)

To confirm the minutes of the budget meeting of the Council held on 8 February, and the extraordinary meeting held on 22 February 2023.

To also confirm the minutes of the extraordinary Council meeting held on 16 March 2023 (attached as **Appendix 1** to this Order Paper).

4. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

To receive any communications or announcements from the Mayor.

5. LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader to comment on the following matters:

- Additional Venues for Voter ID roadshows
- website accessibility user testing
- Guildford Design Awards
- Update on community services and supporting our communities

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

6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No questions or requests to speak have been received from the public in respect of the business to be transacted at this extraordinary meeting.

7. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

Councillor Keith Witham to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, the following question:

“In the interests of full openness and transparency, for both Councillors and the public, would the Leader of the Council please advise the Council:

- (a) how many job posts in GBC have now been deleted as a result of the GBC/WBC collaboration, and list the job titles?*
- (b) how much has been spent from GBC funds – of all funds whether from revenue, capital, or reserve funds to enable those jobs to be removed? and as well as a total, can the relevant figure be shown for each job post deleted?*
- (c) Have phases 1 and 2 of the collaboration now been completed, i.e. the removal of all the senior posts, and joint posts recruited, or if Interims are in post how long will it be to have all joint positions in permanent post?*
- (d) how soon is it expected to then move to phase 3; or when will it be known how many Officer posts in that phase are intended to be deleted and replaced with shared posts?*
- (e) Please also list the additional costs of extra support staff for the joint management team?”*

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

I thank Cllr Witham for this opportunity to set out clearly the financial benefits and costs of the partnership with Waverley Borough Council. The councils’ decision to work together in this way, the first such partnership in Surrey, has already brought financial and other benefits to both councils and will assist us in providing sustainable public services in the face of the massive financial challenge caused by rising costs, increasing demand from residents who need our support, and the reduction in government funding.

While Cllr Witham’s questions and this response focus on the financial impact of the partnership, it may be noted that the councils are at this early stage benefitting in other areas, such as the greater pool of expertise, and reduced duplication in policy work, consultation responses and attendance at wider meetings.

(a) How many job posts in GBC have now been deleted as a result of the GBC/WBC collaboration, and list the job titles?

Guildford Borough Council (GBC) and Waverley Borough Council (WBC) both agreed in July 2021 to create a Joint Management Team (JMT). This was in place in October 2022. It comprises: 1 Chief Executive, 3 Strategic Directors and 12 Executive Heads of Service. WBC’s former structure was 1 Chief Executive, 2 Directors and 8 Heads of Service, which were all deleted. GBC’s roles in scope, which were all deleted, were 1 Managing Director, 3 Directors and 10 senior officers as follows:

- Managing Director*
- Resources Director*
- Service Delivery Director*
- Strategic Services Director*
- Head of Asset Management*

- Head of Community Services
- Head of Culture, Heritage & Leisure Services
- Head of Customer, Case & Parking
- Head of Environment & Regulatory Services
- Head of Housing Services
- Head of Operational & Technical Services
- Head of Place
- Head of Regeneration & Corporate Programmes
- Strategy & Communications Manager

Therefore, 14 roles at GBC and 11 roles at WBC were deleted, and the new JMT of 16 roles was created. Taking account of some additional executive support that has been put in place to support the JMT, the cost to this council of the new structure is currently £421,176 per year less than the old, a saving that will contribute to meeting the severe financial challenges facing our provision of services to local people. We will keep this figure under close review and update annually the data on what the costs of the old teams would have been to ensure that we can report an accurate comparison to councillors in future.

(b) How much has been spent from GBC funds – of all funds whether from revenue, capital, or reserve funds to enable those jobs to be removed? and as well as a total, can the relevant figure be shown for each job post deleted?

The full costs for 2022/23 will be reported at the end of year accounts stage, so the following is provisional and represents the current picture.

The largest costs associated with the transition were redundancy costs associated with the deletion of posts and any staff members that consequently left GBC or WBC. These costs are one-off, in contrast to the savings which recur annually.

Four GBC employees and three WBC employees left as a consequence and the relevant policies were applied. The costs were also shared between the councils on the principles set out in the Inter-Authority Agreement and agreed by the respective Full Council meetings of April 2022. In practice, the costs are higher for GBC to reflect the more generous redundancy policy that applies and the length of service of employees affected.

One of the GBC employees was the former Managing Director. The costs entailed a redundancy payment to the individual, a payment in lieu of part of the notice period and a larger payment to the Surrey local government pension fund in the financial year 2021/22. The redundancy-associated costs were approved by the Full Council meeting on 5 October 2021. The final total cost was £475,448. WBC contributed 50% of the redundancy payment (i.e. £71,554) and so the net cost to GBC was £403,894. This cost was met from the realisation of a capital asset according to the council's Flexible Use of Capital Receipts Strategy 2021.

The remaining costs (for the financial year 2022/23) do not relate to the jobs but are personal to the individuals who held them. They are, therefore, personal information that should not be listed per person publicly. They can be shared with councillors on a confidential basis on request and have been sent to Cllr Witham. For one individual, the correct approval from Full Council was given on 11 October 2022 because the

costs exceeded £95,000. The total cost (redundancy payment to the individual plus any payment to the pension fund if the individual is eligible) of all three GBC employees was £373,133. WBC contributed £76,422. GBC then contributed £65,230 to WBC employee-related costs, and so the net cost to GBC was £361,941.

The GBC one-off costs associated with redundancy were drawn from the Invest-to-Save reserve, which was c. £0.8m at the start of the financial year 2022/23.

In addition, there are some ad hoc costs and savings as a result of legal advice and some temporary expeditious sharing. This further increases 2022/23's in-year savings and will be reported in the end-of-year finance reports.

(c) Have phases 1 and 2 of the collaboration now been completed, i.e. the removal of all the senior posts, and joint posts recruited, or if Interims are in post how long will it be to have all joint positions in permanent post?

The councils in July 2021 agreed to (i) create a JMT, and (ii) request that the JMT bring forward business cases for further collaboration. The first is complete. The second has started and proposals will be brought forward to the new councils on options. As per the original July 2021 council report, these will include options on services, premises, IT and HR policies.

(d) How soon is it expected to then move to phase 3; or when will it be known how many Officer posts in that phase are intended to be deleted and replaced with shared posts?

As there are no concrete or agreed proposals, this is not known, and will be discussed with the new councillor leaderships after the May 2023 elections. Any proposals that affect employees will require the proper consultations with them and the recognised unions.

(e) Please also list the additional costs of extra support staff for the joint management team?

In the old structure, GBC had 2 full-time equivalent employees providing executive support and WBC had 7. The new structure has 11.5 and is shared between the councils. Therefore, the cost to GBC has increased by £99,027. This is included within the figure in section (a) above to give the overall annual saving to GBC of £421,176 as a result of the creation of the JMT.

8. ADOPTION OF GUILDFORD BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES (Pages 35 – 444 of the Council agenda)

Update:

At its meeting on 20 March 2023, the Executive considered the report on this matter. The draft minute is attached as **Appendix 2** to this Order Paper.

The Motion:

The Deputy Leader of the Council, and Lead Councillor for Finance and Planning Policy, Councillor Joss Bigmore to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane to second, the adoption of the following motion:

- “(1) That the Local Plan: Development Management Policies (as set out in Appendix 4 to the report), which incorporates the Inspector’s Main Modifications (at Appendix 2 to the report) and the Council’s Minor Modifications (at Appendix 3 to the report), be adopted.
- (2) That the Secretary of State be requested to exercise his powers to revoke the ‘residual’ policies of the 2003 Local Plan.
- (3) That updates to the Guildford Borough Policies Map be adopted in line with the Local Plan: Development Management Policies including additions proposed at Appendix A of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies, as amended by the Inspector’s main modification 6.
- (4) That the Lead Councillor with portfolio responsibility for Planning Policy be authorised, in consultation with the Joint Strategic Director of Place, to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the LPDMP as they may deem necessary.

Reasons:

1. To enable the adoption of the LPDMP in line with the Council’s Local Development Scheme and for the plan to become part of the Council’s development plan, carrying full weight in the determination of planning applications.
2. To enable the revocation of the ‘residual’ Local Plan 2003 policies that are not superseded by policies contained in the LPDMP.
3. To ensure that changes are brought about to the policies map in line with the adoption of the LPDMP.
4. To enable minor alterations to be made to the LPDMP should they be necessary prior to publication.”

Comments:

Councillor Catherine Young

9. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE FORMAL REVIEW OF THE INTER-AUTHORITY AGREEMENT AND THE COLLABORATION RISK REGISTER (DECEMBER 2022) (Pages 445 – 450 of the Council agenda)

Update:

At its meeting on 17 March 2023, the Joint Governance Committee considered the proposed amendment to clause 21.1 of the Inter-Authority Agreement and have recommended to both councils the adoption of paragraph (2) of the recommendation (see page 446 of the agenda).

At its full council meeting yesterday evening, Waverley Borough Council gave its formal approval to paragraphs (1) and (2) of the recommendation.

The Motion:

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

“(1) That the terms of reference of the Joint Appointments Committee be amended as follows:

(a) Delete the following:

“SUBSTITUTES: Substitutes shall not be appointed”

(b) Insert the following:

“SUBSTITUTES: Substitutes may be appointed. Guildford Borough Council may appoint two substitute members. Waverley Borough Council may appoint two substitute members, with one being nominated by the Leader of the council, and one nominated by the Leader of Waverley’s Principal Opposition Group.”

(2) That clause 21.1 of the Inter-Authority Agreement be amended to read:

“21 TERMINATION FOR CAUSE

21.1 Without affecting any other right or remedy available to it, any Party may terminate this Agreement ~~with immediate effect~~ by giving ~~written notice to~~ a minimum of three months’ notice in writing to the other Party”

Reason:

To ensure that any recommended change to the inter-authority agreement following a review is reported to the full Council meetings of both authorities

Comments:

None

10. MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Pages 451 - 470 of the Council agenda)

To receive and note the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 26 January, 22 and 23 February 2023, which are attached to the Council agenda.

Comments:

None

11. COMMON SEAL

To order the Common Seal.

* * * *

This page is intentionally left blank

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of Guildford Borough Council held in the Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on Thursday 16 March 2023

The Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth

* The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Masuk Miah (in the chair)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| * Councillor Paul Abbey | * Councillor Julia McShane |
| Councillor Tim Anderson | * Councillor Ann McShee |
| * Councillor Jon Askew | * Councillor Bob McShee |
| * Councillor Christopher Barrass | * Councillor Richard Morris |
| * Councillor Joss Bigmore | * Councillor Marsha Moseley |
| * Councillor David Bilbé | * Councillor Ramsey Nagaty |
| * Councillor Chris Blow | * Councillor Susan Parker |
| * Councillor Ruth Brothwell | * Councillor George Potter |
| Councillor Colin Cross | * Councillor Jo Randall |
| * Councillor Guida Esteves | * Councillor John Redpath |
| * Councillor Graham Eyre | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| Councillor Andrew Gomm | * Councillor John Rigg |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin | Councillor Tony Rooth |
| Councillor David Goodwin | * Councillor Will Salmon |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | * Councillor Deborah Seabrook |
| * Councillor Gillian Harwood | * Councillor Pauline Searle |
| Councillor Jan Harwood | * Councillor Paul Spooner |
| * Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor James Steel |
| * Councillor Tom Hunt | * Councillor Cait Taylor |
| Councillor Diana Jones | * Councillor James Walsh |
| Councillor Steven Lee | * Councillor Fiona White |
| * Councillor Nigel Manning | * Councillor Keith Witham |
| * Councillor Ted Mayne | * Councillor Catherine Young |

*Present

CO137 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth, and Councillors Tim Anderson, Colin Cross, Andrew Gomm, David Goodwin, Diana Jones, and Tony Rooth, and also from Honorary Aldermen Catherine Cobley, Sarah Creedy, Jayne Marks, Tony Phillips, Lynda Strudwick and Jenny Wicks.

CO138 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CO139 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications from the Mayor.

CO140 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader reported on the following matters to the Council:

- (a) Crowdfund Guildford project deadline: the deadline to create a project was Wednesday 29 March. The Council had increased its maximum pledge to £10,000 for this funding round, and we were looking for projects that would help the community. Councillors were asked to raise awareness of the project within their local communities.

- (b) Coronation pages live on website: Plans for the Coronation weekend and how residents could get involved were now live on the Council's website. The pages covered information about the Coronation, how to host a Coronation event, activities across the Borough, how to get involved and a link to the official Coronation toolkit.
- (c) Last week of Matisse exhibition: the Matisse exhibition at Guildford House Gallery would run until 25 March 2023. The exhibition showcased 35 posthumous prints of the cut-outs produced by Henri Matisse in the last four years of his life, including many of his iconic images, such as The Snail and the Blue Nudes.
- (d) Voter ID roadshow: The Communications team and staff from Electoral Services had been out in the borough talking to residents about Voter ID. The purpose of the campaign was to make sure residents know that they would need photo ID to vote at a polling station on 4 May 2023. The latest Voter ID roadshow had been held earlier in the day at The Hive. The Council would be announcing more road show dates around the borough very soon. In addition, the Council had arranged for the delivery of a leaflet on Voter ID, produced by the Electoral Commission, to every household in the borough, and a further leaflet, produced by the Council, would be included in council tax bills. The Leader also referred to the cards that had been placed on each desk in the Council Chamber, for every councillor, which included on one side a QR code that linked to further information on the Electoral Commission's website and, on the other, examples of valid photo ID.

In response to an enquiry as to whether the roadshow would include destinations outside of the town area, the Leader confirmed that plans to visit some of the parished areas were in hand and councillors would be informed when these would be taking place.

In response to a question as to whether it would be possible for the Communications Teams to produce the card as a J-peg image so that it could be shared by councillors on social media, and also whether councillors could include them on their email signatures, the Leader indicated that these suggestions would be taken up with the Communications team.

CO141 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Sue Wyeth-Price, on behalf of Ash Green Residents Association, addressed the Council in respect of Agenda Item 7: Ash Road Bridge Scheme update and Budget Approval, and made the following points:

- Councillors were reminded that this project would cost at least £44m and would in debt all residents of the borough for decades, spread pollution over a wide area, and not deliver benefits.
- £9m had been spent to date, with no discernible progress made
- The Council had neither a construction contract, nor a contract with landowners in place, so did not know what the actual cost of the project would be.
- Uncertainty over possible contributions from Surrey County Council, Network Rail, and developers
- The Council hoped that the road bridge would improve safety, but the safety problems were with pedestrians, not cars.
- The bridge would not prevent rat-running or alleviate existing bottlenecks.
- No consideration had been given to alternative traffic solutions.
- Residents had not been asked whether they actually wanted the bridge.

CO142 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

There were no questions, on notice, from councillors.

CO143 ASH ROAD BRIDGE SCHEME UPDATE AND BUDGET APPROVAL

A recorded vote was requested in respect of the motion to approve the budget and funding strategy for the Ash Road Bridge project, which was supported by four other councillors in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19 (d).

The Council considered an update report on progress with the Ash Road Bridge Scheme, which included a reappraisal of the budget and funding in respect of the project. Councillors noted that the project comprised a long-term infrastructure solution to the current and future issues posed by the Ash level crossing, including increased usage associated with housing growth in the Ash and Tongham area and greater barrier downtime resulting from enhanced rail use of the North Downs Line.

The Scheme was being delivered in two Stages. Stage 1 was the delivery of the road bridge over the railway line (and closure of the level crossing to motorised vehicles), and Stage 2 the delivery of the footbridge in the vicinity of Ash level crossing, to enable Ash level crossing to be closed permanently to all users.

The Council had approved the Scheme in April 2021, with a budget of £33.8 million for Stage 1 (road bridge) and £5.02 million for Stage 2 (footbridge) and funding from Homes England of £23.9 million. Due to challenging economic and market conditions the budget for Stage 1 (road bridge) had increased. Although, the Ash Road Bridge would bring substantial improvements to the local community and economy, the Executive was concerned about how the ongoing annual costs would be met. In noting the progress of this project since it was initially commissioned in 2015 and the benefits it would bring, the Executive had requested that further discussions be held with Surrey County Council as the transport and highways authority, Network Rail and Homes England on the ongoing impact of the costs of the bridge to local public services.

The report had set out, in the exempt appendices, the new budget and funding strategy for Stage 1 (road bridge) of the Scheme. The report noted that the final details of this could be subject to change following ongoing evaluation of the tenders received from the contractors in late January 2023 and their final offer in March 2023, including the impact on the Medium-Term Financial Plan. The report had also set out the funding strategy for Stage 2 of the Scheme (the footbridge).

The Council was informed that the approved budget for the Scheme was £38.91 million, being £33.89 million for the road bridge (Stage 1) and £5.02 million for the footbridge (Stage 2) (excluding borrowing costs.) The road bridge budget was slightly higher than that which had been approved by the Council in April 2021 (£38.79million) as the budget had subsequently combined with a separate approved budget for land acquisition costs for the Ash Road Bridge Scheme equivalent to £0.12 million. The revised budget was £44.5 million, being £44.0 million for the road bridge and £0.5 million for the footbridge (excluding borrowing costs.) The increase to the budget was therefore £5.59 million.

The Order Paper circulated to councillors at the meeting included a further update to the Funding Paper (Exempt Appendix 3 to the Council report) which had set out the implications for the funding strategy of the recent offer by Surrey County Council to make a contribution of £5m towards the scheme.

At its meeting earlier in the day, the Executive had also considered the report, including the further update to the Funding Paper, and had recommended to the Council approval of the budget and funding strategy, as updated.

The Lead Councillor for Regeneration, Councillor John Rigg, proposed and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, seconded a motion to approve the budget and funding

strategy as set out in the Exempt Appendices 2 and 3 to the report submitted to the Council, subject to the revisions to the Funding Paper in Appendix 3, as set out in the Order Paper.

The Council debated the information contained in the public report. The following points were made by councillors:

- The Lead Councillor noted that, in addition to Surrey County Council's contribution, it was possible that further grants might become available next year, but no allowance had been made in the budget and discussions were being held with Network Rail in respect of a contribution to the footbridge.
- The project was hugely important in terms of infrastructure delivery, and it was long overdue
- The bridge would create traffic problems and make rat-running worse
- There was a need to work with the County Council to mitigate against some of the highways issues identified
- Network Rail had previously classified the safety risk as medium-to-high for pedestrians, not for vehicles on this crossing. A footbridge would nullify this risk.
- Concern over the lack of clarity over the final cost of the bridge and the contingency being factored in being too low.
- All the highways and traffic related issues were debated at length and taken into account both as part of the Local Plan, when it was a requirement of Policy A31 and when planning permission was granted in 2021.
- The rat running through local roads was mainly caused by people who want to avoid the delays at the level crossing.
- Whilst it was true that much of the new housing would not directly link to the bridge, people from those properties would be feeding onto the same roads that were already being used to avoid the crossing.
- In response to claims that some local people did not want the road bridge, the Council's attention was drawn to a petition lodged in 2004 to the former Guildford Local Committee from Ash residents asking for a bridge to be built on the basis that it would remove a congestion hotspot delaying vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists caused by the present level crossing.
- Construction of the significant additional housing in the area was not conditional on the construction of the road bridge.
- Failure to deliver a road bridge now, and take advantage of significant government funding, might mean that a bridge would never be built.
- Surrey County Council, as the Highway Authority, should be paying for and building this bridge.
- Delays in getting to this stage had caused the significant increase in cost from £12.9m to £44m.
- The benefits of the bridge had not been set out, neither had the mitigations or the cost of them. There also appeared to be little evidence of public approval for the bridge.
- In response to concerns that further delays and the already tight timescale might prevent the Council from drawing down the Homes England funding, the Lead Councillor reassured the Council that Homes England had indicated that they would be flexible provided there was sufficient evidence of progress being made.
- Concern over uncertainty around construction costs and the cost of the land on which the bridge would be built.
- The bridge would alleviate traffic congestion in Ash and improve air quality

Following the debate in public, and upon the motion of the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Masuk Miah, seconded by Councillor Tom Hunt, the Council

RESOLVED: That under Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of Appendices 2, 3, 4, and 5 to the report and the Appendix to the Order Paper on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraphs 3 and 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the 1972 Act.

Following discussion in private of the contents of the exempt appendices referred to above, the Council resumed the meeting in public, and

RESOLVED: To approve the budget and funding strategy as set out in Exempt Appendices 2 and 3 to the report submitted to the Council, subject to the revisions to Appendix 3 as set out in the exempt Appendix 1 to the Order Paper circulated at the meeting.

Reasons:

This was a unique opportunity to utilise £23.9 million of central government funding towards the Ash Road Bridge Scheme to deliver an alternative road crossing of the North Downs railway line in close proximity to the Ash level crossing. The Ash Road Bridge Scheme formed a requirement of Policy A31 of the Council's Local Plan which allocated land for housing in Ash. Delivery of this scheme would also enable the closure of Ash level crossing to motor vehicles, which would improve safety for highway and rail users and significantly reduce traffic congestion on the A323 and the use of alternative local roads to avoid the Ash level crossing in Ash.

Result of the Recorded Vote:

The motion to approve the budget and funding strategy above was approved, with thirty-four councillors voting in favour, one voting against, and four abstentions, as follows:

FOR:

Councillor Jon Askew
Councillor Christopher Barrass
Councillor Joss Bigmore
Councillor Chris Blow
Councillor Ruth Brothwell
Councillor Guida Esteves
Councillor Angela Goodwin
Councillor Angela Gunning
Councillor Gillian Harwood
Councillor Liz Hogger
Councillor Tom Hunt
Councillor Nigel Manning
Councillor Ted Mayne
Councillor Julia McShane
Councillor Ann McShee
Councillor Bob McShee
The Deputy Mayor,
Councillor Masuk Miah
Councillor Richard Morris
Councillor Marsha Moseley
Councillor George Potter
Councillor Jo Randall
Councillor John Redpath
Councillor Maddy Redpath
Councillor John Rigg
Councillor Will Salmon
Councillor Deborah Seabrook
Councillor Pauline Searle
Councillor Paul Spooner

AGAINST:

Councillor Graham Eyre

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Paul Abbey
Councillor David Bilbé
Councillor Ramsey Nagaty
Councillor Susan Parker

FOR:

Councillor James Steel
Councillor Cait Taylor
Councillor James Walsh
Councillor Fiona White
Councillor Keith Witham
Councillor Catherine Young

AGAINST:

ABSTAIN:

CO144 APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY ELECTORAL REGISTRATION OFFICERS

The Council noted that, under Section 8(2) of the Representation of the People Act 1983, the Council must appoint an Officer to the position of Electoral Registration Officer (ERO). This position was responsible for maintaining the Electoral Register for the area.

The Chief Executive was the appointed ERO for Guildford Borough Council. Under Section 52(2) of the 1983 Act, the Council may approve the appointment of Deputy EROs to perform and exercise any of the duties and powers of the ERO. Due to recent changes in electoral legislation being likely to increase demand for urgent decisions by the ERO, it would be necessary to appoint Deputy EROs to assist with the effective discharge of duties to deliver the forthcoming local elections, and subsequent elections.

In order to provide maximum flexibility in respect of such appointments, and to avoid the necessity of bringing further reports to Council whenever such appointments were required, the Council was requested to delegate authority to appoint Deputy Electoral Registration Officers to the Electoral Registration Officer. This delegation mirrored that in respect of the Chief Executive's role as Returning Officer in that he may appoint Deputies as required.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Planning Development, Legal and Democratic Services, Councillor Tom Hunt, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, the Council

RESOLVED: That the Council delegates authority to the Electoral Registration Officer to appoint Deputy Electoral Registration Officers, subject to such appointees holding satisfactory qualifications and experience as required.

Reason:

In order to provide maximum flexibility in respect of such appointments for the purpose of discharging new requirements following changes in electoral law, and to avoid the necessity of bringing further reports to Council whenever such appointments are required.

CO145 COMMON SEAL

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to any documents to give effect to any decisions taken by the Council at this meeting.

The meeting finished at 8.59 pm

Signed
Mayor

Date

DRAFT MINUTE: EXECUTIVE 20 MARCH 2023

ADOPTION OF GUILDFORD BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

The Local Plan: Development Management Policies (hereafter referred to as 'the LPDMP') was the second part of Guildford's Local Plan. If adopted by full Council on 22 March 2023 it would supersede the extant Local Plan 2003 policies and become part of the Council's Development Plan. The LPDMP provided the more detailed policies to be used by Development Management in the determination of planning applications. The Lead Councillor for Finance and Planning Policy introduced the report.

The intention of the policies was to provide the Council with the tools to secure good development across the borough covering a wide range of environmental, design, heritage and infrastructure matters. The policies would provide robust testing through the application process to obtain sustainable and attractive development. The policies would provide guidance to applicants for what the Council would like to see coming forward or reasons for refusal if applications did not meet the standards. The existing policies were nearly 20 years old and no longer fit for purpose.

The Executive noted the extensive consultation undertaken for the Regulation 18 and 19 process during the previous two years. Much work had been undertaken by councillors and officers to reach the point of submission to the Government appointed Planning Inspectorate in the summer of 2022. A series of public hearings had been heard with the inspector arriving at a number of recommendations for the Council concerning both minor and main modifications. The main modifications were subject to further public consultation concluding in early February 2023. The inspector's final report was received at the end of February and was published and circulated to all councillors. The final report found the Council's policies sound, subject to the main modifications being implemented.

The main modification for biodiversity net gain was highlighted to the Executive. The Council's draft policy set out a requirement for 20% across all developments. However, even if adopted by the Council, this could not be implemented until the Government policy of 10% was adopted. It was anticipated that would be in November 2023.

The draft policies were described by the Deputy Leader as robust having been through strenuous testing by officers, councillors and the public consultation process. It was acknowledged that not every suggestion submitted could have been included in the final drafts but that all suggestions had been considered through the consultation processes. The policies were commended to the Executive to recommend to full Council.

The Executive was also asked to consider and adopt a new Parking Policy Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Whilst Policy ID10 did consider parking standards, it was considered preferable to retain a separate SPD which could be easily updated and was consequently more flexible and responsive. This had been approved by the inspector who required no main modifications to ID10 and had agreed to the split of guidance and policy. The adoption of the SPD was a matter for

the Executive, but that adoption remained dependent upon the overall adoption of the LPDMP by full Council because of the link of the guidance to the policy.

The LPDMP and the SPD were welcomed by the Executive, including the split in guidance and policy with regard to parking. It was noted that the biodiversity 20% net gain had been included in the Council's Climate Change SPD which had been previously adopted. Although this was guidance and not policy the Council had been able to signpost its preferences in this matter. It was reported that developers had taken notice and responded positively within planning applications.

The report would be considered by full Council on Wednesday 22 March 2023. The Executive,

RESOLVED:

- (1) That subject to the adoption of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies, the Parking Standards for New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (at Appendix 6 to the report submitted to the Executive) be adopted.
- (2) That the Lead Councillor with portfolio responsibility for Planning Policy be authorised, in consultation with the Joint Strategic Director of Place, to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the Parking Standards for New Development SPD as they may deem necessary.
- (3) That the Executive's comments be passed to the full Council meeting on 22 March 2023 via the Order Paper.

The Executive further

RECOMMEND (to Council):

- (1) That the Local Plan: Development Management Policies (as set out in Appendix 4 to the report), which incorporates the Inspector's Main Modifications (at Appendix 2 to the report) and the Council's Minor Modifications (at Appendix 3 to the report), be adopted.
- (2) That the Secretary of State be requested to exercise his powers to revoke the 'residual' policies of the 2003 Local Plan.
- (3) That updates to the Guildford Borough Policies Map be adopted in line with the Local Plan: Development Management Policies including additions proposed at Appendix A of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies, as amended by the Inspector's main modification 6.
- (4) That the Lead Councillor with portfolio responsibility for Planning Policy be authorised, in consultation with the Joint Strategic Director of Place, to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the LPDMP as they may deem necessary.

Reason(s):

1. To enable the adoption of the Parking Standards for New Development SPD to provide further guidance regarding the implementation of LPDMP Policy ID11 [now Policy ID10]: Parking Standards for New Development.

2. To enable minor alterations to be made to the SPD should they be necessary prior to publication
3. To enable the adoption of the LPDMP in line with the Council's Local Development Scheme and for the plan to become part of the Council's development plan, carrying full weight in the determination of planning applications.
4. To enable the revocation of the 'residual' Local Plan 2003 policies that are not superseded by policies contained in the LPDMP.
5. To ensure that changes are brought about to the policies map in line with the adoption of the LPDMP.
6. To enable minor alterations to be made to the LPDMP should they be necessary prior to publication.

This page is intentionally left blank