



COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2023

ORDER PAPER (Pages 1 - 34)

This page is intentionally left blank



COUNCIL MEETING

TUESDAY 25 JULY 2023

ORDER PAPER

WEBCASTING NOTICE

This meeting will be recorded for 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 Masuk Miah
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 – 26 of the Council agenda)

To confirm, as a correct record, the draft minutes of the Selection Meeting held on 17 May 2023 and the special meeting held on 1 June 2023.

4. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

To receive any communications from the Mayor.

5. LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

Whenever the Leader makes any changes to the Executive, those changes must be reported to the Council at its next ordinary meeting. At the Selection Meeting on 17 May, the newly elected Leader of the Council announced her Executive and indicated that details of their respective portfolio responsibilities would be determined in the week following that meeting.

Details of the Executive including their portfolio titles and responsibilities are attached as **Appendix 1** to this Order Paper.

The Leader to also comment on the following matters:

- Community Wellbeing Team named Finalist in "Make a Difference Awards"
- Annual canvass starting
- Grants for Climate Change initiatives
- Rethink waste

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

6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No members of the public have registered to speak or ask a question.

7. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

Councillors will recall that, at the Selection Meeting, the Council received three written questions from Councillors Brooker, Akhtar, and Hughes, all of which were directed at the Leader of the Council. As the Leader was elected at that meeting, no written response to the questions could be prepared for inclusion on the Order Paper for that meeting, and Council was informed that a formal response from the Leader to each of the questions would be circulated to all councillors.

That response was sent, by email, to all councillors on 1 June 2023.

As there was no opportunity for the questioners to ask a supplementary question, the Mayor has agreed to allow this at this meeting.

The three questions and the written response to them are set out below:

(a) **Councillor Philip Brooker** asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“Can the Leader confirm what her plans are to increase social housing in the Borough? How many social houses do you intend to provide on a year-on-year basis over the next four years, what sites have been allocated for this, and how will it be financed?”

The Leader’s Response:

“The Council’s Local Plan seeks delivery of affordable housing as defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Plan includes a requirement for at least 40% of homes on qualifying schemes to be affordable housing provision, the delivery of which is generally secured via section 106 agreement. The quantum of affordable homes delivered through this mechanism is determined in the first instance by the number and size of schemes that the Council permits and that are subsequently delivered, and in the second instance by whether the required 40% contribution is secured on these sites as part of the planning permission. In this regard, a range of sites, including several allocated in the Local Plan, already benefit from planning permission and will deliver required affordable homes over the coming four years. Further, the Council’s Land Availability Assessment reflects several sites which may contribute to affordable housing delivery during the next four years, but are dependent on receiving planning permission in order to commence. We expect an increase in the annual delivery of affordable homes as qualifying sites are permitted and built out.

With regard to the Council’s own development, the Housing Revenue Account Development programme was approved by the Council in February 2023 and details of this were set out within the Council’s Capital and Investment Strategy 2023-24. This can be found on the agenda for the Council meeting on Wednesday 8 February 2023.

The Strategy confirms that the programme will be funded from the Housing Revenue Account Capital receipts and reserves with a current planned investment of £145m and currently includes 152 homes.

As for future plans these will remain under review and will be brought forward as they develop. The official definition of affordable in Surrey is far above what is genuinely affordable, and we continue to be constrained by the Conservative government’s Right to Buy policy. We are committed to providing council homes for rent and for shared ownership to help those needing an affordable place to live”.

(b) **Councillor Bilal Akhtar** asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“Can the Leader confirm the number of staff currently employed in the Council’s planning enforcement team and also outline any intention to recruit additional staff to the Council’s planning enforcement team?”

The Leader’s Response:

“The current establishment within the Planning Enforcement team consists of 1 team leader/1 Senior Enforcement Officer and 4 Planning Enforcement Officers. The team has experienced both periods of staff sickness and periods of vacancies over the last 9 months. Following a recruitment campaign 2 vacancies (senior planning enforcement officer and enforcement planning officer) have been recruited to. One of the appointments was an internal appointment, and there is currently an advert for the vacant post. There is currently no approved funding, or plans, to recruit additional staff to the Planning Enforcement team.”

(c) **Councillor Bob Hughes** asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

“Can the Leader please confirm how much the Council has so far spent on agency and temporary staff in 2022-23 across the organisation? What is the projected budget for 2023-24? And can you confirm how much the Council has spent so far on consultants in 2022-23? What is the projected budget for 2023-24?”

The Leader’s Response:

“In 2022-23 the Council spent £4.18m on temporary staff and £28.68m on consultancy support. £25.3m of that consultancy spend related to capital expenditure. This data will not be fully validated until the Finance Team bring their Annual Agency and Consultancy Spend Report to the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Committee in July. The projected costs of temporary and consultancy support for 2023-24 have not yet been calculated but these will be provided in future quarterly budget monitoring reports”.

Further Questions from Councillors:

(d) **Councillor Maddy Redpath** to ask the Lead Councillor for Planning, Environment, and Climate Change, Councillor George Potter the following question:

“The early summer has seen a larger number of Unauthorised Encampments than in recent years. The effects have been significant on the regular users of our Parks and Recreation Grounds, with events such as the Park Run cancelled, and anti-social and intimidating behaviour affecting the enjoyment of our award-

winning green spaces. There are also significant management and clean-up costs that our Council Tax payers have to bear.

1. What is the Lead Councillor doing to review and improve the physical deterrents around our parks and green spaces?
2. What is the latest update on the long-promised Surrey Transit Site?
3. It is also disappointing that the Police have not used the extra powers they have been granted to expedite the removal process, can you explain why?

The Lead Councillor's Response:

1. What is the Lead Councillor doing to review and improve the physical deterrents around our parks and green spaces?

Unauthorised encampments are managed through Regulatory Services with the operational support of the department upon whose land an unauthorised encampment has occurred. Whilst we endeavour to respond to queries, we would generally update our website and follow published process for managing an unauthorised encampment. We would therefore ask concerned residents to check our website for information and updates first:

<https://www.guildford.gov.uk/article/26846/Find-out-more-about-Unauthorised-Encampments>

The Parks Team work hard to limit the opportunities for unauthorised access, and our defences are reviewed and updated following any unauthorised access. We have visited each park and created risk assessments for unauthorised access resulting in many improvements to upgrade and install defences over the years.

In most areas we use earth bunds as the most cost-effective measure, but also use other methods such as boulders, tree and hedge planting also drop-down posts behind gates. Examples of this approach in practice are Bellfields Green and Shalford Common. These sites are large open spaces with fine views without boundaries surrounded by housing. This was risk assessed and schemes were designed to protect the site boundaries that we consulted residents about. These open spaces were protected in 2020 by a combination of knee-high rails, bunds, new tree planting, timber bollards and wildflower planting.

Recent unauthorised accesses have focused on legitimate and needed access points using a variety of means to defeat locked gates and barriers.

As a result, the parks team are placing concrete blocks and procuring further bollards in vulnerable points, in particular access gates.

A balance needs to be struck between the general appearance of the site, cost, the need for legitimate access, including for emergency access such as an ambulance, and the potential deterrent. Unfortunately, there are no defences that are unbreachable and in the event of an unauthorised encampment we must follow due legal processes.

Over recent years in Stoke Park the Parks Team have installed new earth bunds at the Wildwood Car Park, strengthened/ replaced earth bunds at London Road and near the Bowling Club. We also replaced the entrance gates from the Nightingale Road Car park adding height barriers and new Estate Fencing. At present, Stoke Park is surrounded by fencing, ditches and earth bunds in all locations except access points. These are protected by locked gates and barriers.

Following the most recent unauthorised access of Stoke Park through the grounds of Guildford High School, the Parks Team have placed concrete blocks at a number of access gates.

We have met with Guildford High School who will also place additional bollards in front of this gate. We will be replacing these blocks with metal bollards to allow speedier legitimate access this month.

Further bollards are in the process of being installed at all gates at Onslow Arboretum and Dann's Meadow in Ash.

2. *What is the latest update on the long-promised Surrey Transit Site? Surrey County Council has provided the following update:*

“The Pendell Camp site (between Merstham and Bletchingley) is under review following further engagement with planning. The commitment to take forward remains, and the focus is on ensuring the planning application has the best chance of achieving approval. The specific work underway at the moment refers to works that are needed to the northern permanent site, which should make the planning application for the southern/transit site more acceptable in planning terms.”

3. *It is also disappointing that the Police have not used the extra powers they have been granted to expedite the removal process, can you explain why? We have asked the Police to comment on this, and their response is as follows:*

'In Guildford we have been very proactive in using our powers when they are proportionate and justified and have recently used them over May and June in removing Unauthorised Encampments (UEs) from Shalford, Guildford Spectrum and Onslow.

There are set criteria that need to be met to use these new powers to remove a UE and that threshold is not always met. If the threshold is not met then the UEs are kept under constant review by police and sometimes after a period of time the criteria is then met, and we will use powers available to us.

The key point in the new legislation is they have caused, or are likely to cause, significant damage, disruption, or distress. This means that it would have to be significant rather than just an annoyance to the local community. In some cases, moving on a UE will cause more harm as they move to a less suitable/safe site. We have no alternative site in Surrey so are unable to direct the UE to that location. Sometimes using these powers may cause a bigger impact on the community and we should ensure that the action we take is proportionate, justified, and necessary.

It is also important to point out that the offence is when the person fails to comply with the request to leave and not just by setting up a camp. The key part in the legislation is 'The offence will be committed if a person who resides or intends to reside with a vehicle on land fails to leave the land or remove their property without reasonable excuse when asked to do so and they have caused, or are likely to cause, significant damage, disruption, or distress.'

In all cases of a reported UE police will as soon as possible attend the location and make an initial assessment, speak with those residents of the encampment, and issue a code of conduct. We work with the local authority and discuss our options and powers. Just because this legislation exists it does not mean it will always be the best option just like arresting someone is not always the only or most suitable option for a criminal offence.

In many cases removal of a UE is led by the local authority. Police regularly visit the UE throughout and conduct reassessments. Crime/ASB and disorder is monitored and anything that is linked to the UE is identified.

Key decisions need to be made by police around how we use this legislation. What we often find is that we may have complaints from residents about a UE but there is no evidence of damage, disruption or distress and nothing to support the use of these powers in showing it is significant. We encourage residents to report all incidents to Surrey Police via 999 in an emergency or 101 / online in non-emergency cases.

Lastly the guidance published by the home office in relation to this new legislation stipulates that police should liaise with local authorities and any action should be driven through a multi agency response. It does not state the police must lead. The guidance goes on to say that local authorities should take the lead and the police support this. Finally, the guidance stipulates the decision upon which these powers are used remains at the discretion of the police.

I understand a UE can cause concerns for residents and want to reassure them that when justified and proportionate police will robustly use powers available to us as we have done in the past. I am more than happy to discuss with councillors the legislation and why there are limitations on its use.'

(e) **Councillor Keith Witham** to ask the Lead Councillors for Planning, Environment, and Climate Change, and Regulatory and Democratic Services, Councillors George Potter and Merel Rehorst-Smith the following question:

*"Residents of Ash Road, Worplesdon are seriously concerned regarding the use of the premises "Greenways" on Ash Road, Fox Corner by "Applenet Care and Support" to house ex-offenders and others with mental health issues, despite the provider **NOT** having planning consent for that, or any other commercial use, and **NOT** having been licenced by GBC Licensing as an HMO (House in Multiple Occupation), with multiple incidents reported to the police of anti-social behaviour affecting the immediate area, including arson.*

Fox Corner is a small rural residential area, located in between Guildford and

Woking. It is an isolated area with a limited bus service, and miles from community facilities such as food shops or any employment opportunities in either Woking or Guildford and totally unsuitable for such an establishment.

So would the Executive Members for Planning/ Enforcement and Regulatory Services please update the Council on the investigations carried out into the Planning and Enforcement situation, and the HMO licence, and the current position regarding Greenways, Ash Road, Worplesdon?”

The Lead Councillors’ Response:

“The Council’s Private Sector Housing Team have been investigating the use of the building as a house in multiple occupation (HMO). They have been in discussion with Applenet Care and Support who work with Surrey County Council to re-integrate individuals back into the community. Whilst there have been issues reported by residents, Applenet Care and Support have taken steps to address issues such as the lack of boundary fencing, and they have installed CCTV on-site. Officers have also reviewed the company’s complaints procedure and ensured that procedures and processes are in place to control and respond to ASB including enabling local residents to report any issues directly to the company.

Officers have also worked with the Police in respect of the alleged arson and anti-social behaviour. We are advised that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the alleged arson. There has been one other report to the Police regarding insulting behaviour that was between individuals inside the property.

After a thorough evaluation, officers within Regulatory Services have advised that they have found there was not sufficient evidence of current and ongoing anti-social behaviour or other valid reasons to refuse to licence the property as a house in multiple occupation under the Housing Act 2004. The property has therefore now been licensed as a house in multiple occupation for up to 6 persons. The licence was issued on 17 July 2023 and is valid for 5 years. This licence simply confirms that the property is suitable to be occupied by up to 6 residents not forming a single household and imposes standards in respect of amenities, means of escape in case of fire and controlling ASB.

In terms of planning, the Planning Enforcement Team are of the opinion that the use currently happening at the property is within Use Class C2, which relates to residential institutions including residential care homes. The applicants are refuting this and are claiming the current use of the property falls within Use Class C3 (dwellinghouses) and specifically subsection b) which

includes within the definition of a dwellinghouse the use by not more than six residents living together as a single household where care is provided for residents. The Planning Enforcement Team understand the applicants are currently collating a Certificate of Lawfulness to argue their point, providing the Local Planning Authority an opportunity to consider any further evidence they have and present a formal view on the use of the property through the lawful development certificate process."

- (f) **Councillor James Walsh** to ask the Lead Councillor for Commercial Services, Councillor Catherine Houston the following question:

"Grassroots football is an important "social glue" that binds communities, clubs and individuals together in many British towns. Our local club, Guildford City FC is 102 years-old this year and has played at the Spectrum since 1996. Unfortunately, its current venue is no longer fit for purpose and the club was denied promotion in 2012 because it failed a ground grading inspection that year. Can the Lead Councillor for Commercial Services tell the Council what discussions she has had, or plans to have, to help ensure that Guildford City Football Club will have a ground and facilities within the borough fit for the 21st century?"

The Lead Councillor's Response:

"Thank you, Councillor Walsh, for your question around support for Guildford City Football Club, something we as an administration wish to continue. There has been a lot of activity on this matter over the last couple of months in an attempt to get to the crux of the issues you raise. Following a meeting with the Club in late May to discuss the state of the pitch, which the Leader and Ian Doyle, one of our strategic directors attended, a list of concerns and questions were raised by the Club. I am pleased to report that subsequently a tri-partite meeting took place at The Spectrum with Freedom Leisure, Guildford City Football Club and Guildford Borough Council earlier this month to look at the issues raised by the Club and agree a way forward. All issues raised at the earlier onsite meeting were discussed in detail and an action plan set out. As reported recently in the 'Guildford Dragon', the Club felt the meeting was both useful and productive.

The key challenge accepted by all parties is the dual use element of the ground and the lack of the Club's status on the site. They book the pitch annually, therefore there is no long-term arrangement, such as a lease, that would allow them to attract external funding. There are also definitely pinch points when athletics and football use collide. We will work hard with all parties to create a more effective way of operating going forward but some issues will be

difficult to resolve by the very nature of the site, which has not changed since 1996 when the Club moved in. I have asked officers to keep me apprised of the actions being taken and report any feedback.”

(g) **Councillor Joss Bigmore** to ask the Lead Councillor for Planning, Environment, and Climate Change, Councillor George Potter the following question:

“The Review of the Local Plan is due to be completed at the latest by the end of April next year. As things stand there have been no changes in the National Legislation which means that GBC’s Local Plan will be out of date as there is the more recent ‘Standard Method’ now used to calculate housing need.

Ceteris paribus this would mean GBC needing to find another 200 homes a year to justify having a robust 5-year Housing supply when assessing applications, failure to do that could see the resultant tilted balance allowing speculative unplanned development. This will be a concerning situation to many residents, already uncomfortable with the quantum of development we are seeing today.

Could the Lead Councillor for Planning, Environment and Climate Change please explain what preparations are being made so that GBC is ready with evidence to counter the housing need as calculated by the Standard Method?”

The Lead Councillors’ Response:

The Government has continued to signal their intention to revise the Standard Method given its reliance on now out dated 2014-based household projections. The latest announcement earlier this year indicated that they would publish a revised Standard Method in early 2024. This may bring Guildford’s figure down from the current figure of approximately 780 dwellings per annum closer to the current Local Plan annual requirement figure of 562.

Whilst planning practice guidance states that the Standard Method figure is not mandatory, an alternative figure is only expected to be found acceptable in exceptional circumstances with robust evidence that would be scrutinised at a local plan examination. In the meantime, if the review of the Local Plan concludes that the housing requirement figure requires updating, the future five-year land supply calculation will need to be assessed against the Standard Method figure for the entire period during which the local plan is being updated. Until there is greater clarity in terms of how the Standard Method will be amended and therefore what opportunities may exist for Guildford

specific circumstances to justify deviation from this, it is neither possible nor appropriate to commission what would otherwise be abortive work by the time an updated plan is submitted to the Secretary of State for examination (plan preparation would take a number of years). Thus, it is only as part of a Local Plan update that the Council will investigate the possibility of reducing the local housing need figure according to the Standard Method. Despite this, preparatory work will continue in order to inform the Formal Review of the Local Plan. This will include, when appropriate, gathering a proportionate and relevant evidence base to understand any changed circumstances affecting the borough. Work will be progressing to populate the templates created by the Planning Advisory Service in order to determine whether or not the local plan policies, and therefore the Plan itself, need to be updated.

In the meantime, the priority will remain the continued effort to bring forward existing allocations in a timely and sustainable manner to maintain future delivery rates. Doing so increases the possibility that Guildford may be able to continue to demonstrate a five-year land supply even when the current figure of 562 is no longer applicable and reduces opportunities for additional speculative unplanned development that may otherwise be permitted at appeal due to the tilted balance working in favour of the developer.

(h) Councillor Catherine Young to ask the Lead Councillor for Planning, Environment, and Climate Change, Councillor George Potter the following question:

“In 2019 Guildford Borough Council declared a Climate Emergency. Climate Change is now at the heart of all that we do (or should be), and prior to the May Elections, the Executive signed off GBC’s Climate Change ‘Living Action Plan.

It is almost four months since the Climate Change Board (CCB) last met. Would the Lead Councillor please confirm that Climate Change remains a priority for this Council and indicate when the CCB will reconvene?

Additionally, it is noted that despite numerous training sessions and briefings arranged for new Councillors there has not been one scheduled on the Climate Change Action Plan. Would the Lead Councillor agree to arrange this before the Autumn so that all Councillors are up to speed on actions and progress to date?

With this in mind, can the Lead Councillor also commit to provide a full update on the Action Plan to Full Council at the meeting to be held on 10 October 2023.”

The Lead Councillor's Response:

"Thank you, Councillor Young for your question.

I am happy to confirm that tackling climate change remains a top priority for this Council.

Terms of reference for the Climate Change Board (CCB) have now been circulated to group leaders with a request for nominations to join the CCB. Once membership has been agreed the intention is to have an initial meeting as soon as possible and to put in place a regular schedule of meetings thereafter.

The delay in reconstituting the CCB following the election is regrettable, and as portfolio holder I wish to apologise for the delay. Whilst the delay in reconstituting the CCB has not delayed the implementation of the adopted Climate Change Action Plan by officers, it has deprived councillors of a chance to have cross-party oversight and input and I am sorry for that.

*I agree with you that training for councillors and officers is important and note that we have made a firm commitment, within action 2.14 of the climate action plan adopted by the Executive in February, to 'identify training needs for staff, councillors and other stakeholders on the climate emergency and the impact of decisions on carbon emissions'. As noted in the action plan, there will be a need to provide different types of training for different audiences, but I do agree that it is very important that councillors are offered training on this important area of work. I have asked officers to bring forward proposals for how this action can be delivered in the near future. Please note, a new climate change course has been developed and is available through **Surrey Learn**. The course aims to outline the fundamental issues regarding climate change and is accredited by The Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Standards Office with attendees receiving two CPD hours. The Climate Change Team are awaiting confirmation whether this course can be rolled out to both staff and Members. Further training development is required to provide a focus on Guildford and our response to climate change.*

In terms of future updates on the delivery of the climate action plan, the Executive resolved in February that updates would be brought forward by officers or the Climate Change Board on an annual basis; we are aiming to bring the first of these to the Executive by the end of the calendar year at the latest".

- (i) **Councillor David Bilbé** to ask the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane the following question:

“Can the Leader of the Council assure this Council and members of the public that stringent financial measures necessary to balance the budget now and in the medium term will not affect service to the public? If not, then what services will be affected?”

The Leader’s Response:

“The financial situation has been set out clearly in the report at Item 8 on the Council Agenda. The Council must take urgent action now to address its financial sustainability. This will require a significant reduction in the General Fund revenue budget and ultimately will impact on service provision. The Council, led by the task force, will be going through a process as set out in the report to identify and implement an action plan to achieve this objective. The Executive intend to ensure the most vulnerable within our borough are prioritised along with statutory services being delivered legally.

The challenge will be met through a genuine team effort involving members and officers in the decision making and every decision will be taken with the best interests of the residents of the borough at its core. There is a lot of work ahead of us and it cannot be stressed more highly that it is in everyone’s best interests to work together on this challenge”.

- (j) **Councillor Philip Brooker** to ask the Lead Councillor for Community and Organisational Development, Councillor Carla Morson the following question:

“Would the Lead Councillor for Community and Organisational Development advise what are the current staff absence rates and staff turnover rates for last available quarter? How do these compare with the same period last year and the same quarter in 2019?”

How do those figures benchmark against other Councils in Surrey?”

The Lead Councillor’s Response:

- 1) The current staff absence rates and staff turnover rates for the last available quarter:

Quarter 1: 2023-24

All absence – 8.6 days

Short term absence – 5.9 days

Turnover – 16.5%

Note: Turnover in this period includes the TUPE transfer of ‘on street’ Parking Services staff to a contractor.

The figures for Q1 2023-24 with the exclusion of the TUPE transfer of 'on street' parking staff, are as follows:

All absence - 8.3 days
 short term absence - 5.7 days
 Turnover - 15.5%

2) Comparison with the same period last year and the same quarter in 2019

Quarter 1: 2022-23

All absence – 8.2 days
 Short term absence – 5.6 days
 Turnover – 15.1%

Quarter 1: 2019-20

All absence – 7.4 days
 Short term absence – 4.1 days
 Turnover – 10.5%

3) Benchmarking data for Councils in Surrey will be provided direct to councillors as soon as we have permission from other councils to share their data?

(k) **Councillor Bob Hughes** to ask the Lead Councillor for Commercial Services, Councillor Catherine Houston the following question:

“Has the Lead Councillor for Commercial services written to the Cabinet of Surrey County Council to thank them for making a £3 million grant to the Yvonne Arnaud Theatre - the largest ever grant from Your Fund Surrey, thereby securing its future and facilitating the provision of a greater range of accessible services to the people of Guildford?”

Will she agree that in light of this and other significant community projects now funded by Your Fund Surrey, that the Conservative Council were right to ignore their political opponents and persist with this valuable scheme?”

The Lead Councillor’s Response:

"I am pleased to see the Yvonne Arnaud Theatre being awarded some funding, even if it is less than half what they applied for. The Yvonne Arnaud not only makes excellent productions available to their main audience but also does a lot of very good work in the community which is not so widely publicised.

Having said that it is not appropriate for this Council to be discussing the merits of another Council's decision-making, especially when we have serious matters to discuss this evening, matters which will affect all our residents."

NB. Notice of the following additional questions was received by the deadline for submission of questions for this meeting, but unfortunately, they were not forwarded to the Leader/relevant Lead Councillors until this afternoon.

Accordingly, a written response to each of these questions will be circulated by the Leader/relevant lead councillors to all councillors after the meeting. The questioners shall be afforded the opportunity of asking supplementary questions at the next Council meeting.

Question from Cllr. Richard Mills

Will the Leader of the Council indicate whether she will urgently bring forward proposals for a restriction on the maximum height for new buildings in the town, in the light of:

- the continuing development pressures that have driven a steady increase in permitted building height in particular in the Town Centre
- the evidence from recent years that the Council's planning procedures have not proved sufficient to control these pressures in line with the wishes of residents, and
- the evidence from the recent election campaign of wide support among residents from across the political spectrum for commitment to a maximum permitted building height, including from her executive portfolio holder for planning at election hustings.

Question from Cllr. David Bilbé

Will the Leader of the Council advise when will this Council see a fully costed plan for restoring the planning department to an improved level of competence with measurable timescales, targets and specific objectives?

Will the plan include a comprehensive set of proposals and staffing increases to improve the effectiveness of enforcement action, particularly to resolve significant planning infringements on Wanborough fields?

Question from Cllr. Bob Hughes**To ask the Executive Member for Community and Organisational Development:**

What measures are being taken by the Council to attract job applications from people with disabilities, and to sustain them in the workplace?

What input has the Council sought from organisations representative of people with lived experience of disabilities in order to take their advice to help the Council improve their recruitment and retention procedures and policies?

Questions from Cllr. Matt Furniss

1. Can the Leader of the Council confirm what is the valuation of the Council's commercial asset holdings in each year since 2019 to 2023?

In each year how much income was forecast to be generated and how much was actually generated?

2. In December 2020 Guildford, as one of the districts that commissioned a report by KPMG to look at opportunities for collaboration. Can the leader confirm:
 - a) The cost to GBC for producing the report?
 - b) An update as to what is the status of the KPMG report within GBC?
 - c) How many of its recommendations have been accepted and implemented?
 - d) Of the recommendations not accepted, why not?

Question from Cllr. Bilal Akhtar

Can the Leader Confirm the precise reasons for the three-year delay in opening the SANG and the car park in Frog Grove Lane in Wood Street, Worplesdon? The Car Park and Fences have been in place for over two years now.

According to the Officers, there is a delay in resolving an agreement with the land owner and the Council. What measures can be put in place to ensure that this matter can be resolved at the earliest possible time and what is the anticipated opening date?

8. GENERAL FUND BUDGET UPDATE (Pages 27 – 70 of the Council agenda)

Corrections:

- the table in paragraph 7.12 of the report (page 36 of the agenda) should read as follows:

	Pre 2016	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total
Property	30,773	9,682	28,008	3,036	20,404	4,126		5,994	2,278	1,972	106,273
NDH			2,400	2,101	3,201	5,941	4,154	4,296	2,429		24,522
Walnut Bridge			177						1,075		1,251
	30,773	9,682	30,585	5,137	23,605	10,067	4,154	10,290	5,782	1,972	132,046
ARB								3,638	1,453	24,573	29,664
WUV		86	149	1,035	1,962	8,278	8,899	10,728	16,620	43,849	91,605
Major projects	0	86	149	1,035	1,962	8,278	8,899	14,366	18,073	68,422	121,270
Total debt funded :	30,773	9,768	30,733	6,172	25,566	18,345	13,053	24,656	23,854	70,394	253,316

- Substitute the following in place of paragraphs 14.1, 14.2 and 14.3 (Climate Change/Sustainability implications) on page 60 of the agenda:

“14.1 There are no direct implications arising from this report. Although the Council's ability to fund carbon reduction projects is likely to be impacted by the expected spending controls that will need to be put in place.”

Updates:

- (a) In response to a request made by the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee (see below), the business case for investment in Planning Services is attached as **Appendix 2** to this Order Paper. The two figures stated in the tables are £488,105, which was the supplementary estimate agreed by the Executive in November 2022 for 2023-24 and the second set of figures for £692,100 is the total of the growth bid to reflect the new structure submitted to DLUCH as part of our detailed action plan and response to the threat of designation. The final structure may be slightly different, but the amount of growth will remain the same. Due to the reliance on agency staff – still over 50% of the team, the budget with the growth will still be challenging until such time as we can recruit permanent staff.
- (b) Comments from the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee
At its special meeting on 18 July 2023, the Committee made the following comments during its consideration of this matter:

“The Committee noted that, at its budget meeting on 8 February 2023, the Council had approved the 2023-24 budget and the Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP), which had included an £18.3m projected deficit to be resolved,

underwritten by an estimated £32m cash backed usable reserves and £3.75m General Fund working balance reserve. The reasonable worst-case scenario, at that time, was that the Council's expenditure could be met by the resources currently available to it in the immediate term. Council asked the Joint Management Team to undertake a comprehensive financial review to identify a set of measures to address this deficit and present a revised budget and MTFP to Full Council in July 2023. That work had progressed, and the Committee considered the Section 151 Officer's report which set out the findings and recommended actions to be taken, including a 2023-24 General Fund budget revision for Full Council approval.

The Committee had been asked to consider the report and submit its own comments to the Executive at its meeting on 20 July, and to the Council at its meeting on 25 July, in respect of the recommendations contained in the report.

The Lead Councillor for Finance presented the report to the Committee summarising the position the Council was in financially, including the recent historical background highlighting the various factors and circumstances that had contributed to that position, together with the serious implications for the Council. The Lead Councillor also outlined the remedial measures recommended in the report and the anticipated timeline for their implementation.

During the debate, the Committee asked a number of questions and made a number of comments on the contents of the report. The Committee also made the following key points in the debate on this matter which it was proposed to put to the Executive on 20 July:

- It was noted in the discussion on an accountancy treatment of a grant that these sums had been erroneously applied to a reserves heading and were otherwise correctly spent and disposed of.
- It was suggested that the business case for investment in Planning Services should be circulated to councillors in advance of the Full Council meeting and added as a supplementary paper.
- It was felt that the findings in the report should be noted rather than endorsed.
- It was suggested that, rather than having an informal cross-party reference group, the Executive should establish its own working group, to receive and comment on regular updates on the Council's preparations for the Medium-Term Financial Plan restatement in October and its implementation; and to consider options to close the projected financial gap.

- It was noted that the table in paragraph 7.12 of the report showing the increase in the capital programme since 2016 had erroneously shown the capital cost to the Council on the Ash Road Bridge project in 2024 as being £24.573m. The correct figure would be reported to Council.
- It was also noted that paragraphs 14.2 and 14.3 of the report (Climate Change/Sustainability implications) had erroneously repeated the earlier paragraphs 13.2 and 13.3 (Equality and Diversity Implications). Any further information on Climate Change/Sustainability implications should be reported to the Council.

The following changes to the recommendations in the report were therefore suggested for consideration by the Executive:

- Paragraph 2.1 of the recommendation be amended to read: “To approve the restated 2023-24 General Fund Revenue Budget, *including the business case for planning resources.*”
- Paragraph 2.3 of the recommendation be amended to read: “To ~~endorse~~ *note* the findings in this report.”
- Paragraph 2.7 of the recommendation be amended to read: “*To note that an informal cross-party councillor reference group has been the Executive will* set up *an executive working group* for the following purposes:
 - to receive and comment on regular updates on the Council’s preparations for the Medium-Term Financial Plan restatement in October and its implementation;
 - to provide a sounding board for the Executive and officers on the options that are coming forward to close the projected financial gap;
 - and to guide wider communication with councillors and beyond”

(c) Comments from the Executive

At its meeting on 20 July 2023, the Executive received the comments of the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee and accepted that Committee’s suggested changes to the recommendations (see above), with the exception of the suggested change to paragraph 2.3.

(d) The Motion:

The Lead Councillor for Finance & Property, Councillor Richard Lucas to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane to second, the following motion:

“That the Council resolves:

- (1) To approve the restated 2023-24 General Fund Revenue budget including the business case for additional planning resources.
- (2) To approve the repurposing of earmarked reserves as detailed in the report submitted to the Council.
- (3) To endorse the findings in the report.
- (4) To note the response by the Chief Finance (Section 151) Officer to the S114(3) duty and his recommended immediate actions including a range of expenditure controls, which will be managed through a Financial Control Panel consisting of Senior Officers and chaired by the Section 151 Officer.
- (5) To note that a financial recovery plan is being developed by the Chief Finance Officer in liaison with the Joint Management Team, together with milestones and delivery targets, to be reported to October Full Council for approval.
- (6) To endorse the management action of establishing a task force to deliver the financial recovery plan at pace, to provide the capacity, skills, and capability to support recovery.
- (7) To note that the Executive will set up an executive working group for the following purposes:
 - a) to receive and comment on regular updates on the Council’s preparations for the Medium-Term Financial Plan restatement in October and its implementation;
 - b) to provide a sounding board for the Executive and officers on the options that are coming forward to close the projected financial gap; and
 - c) to guide wider communication with councillors and beyond
- (8) To note that expenditure controls as a feature of how the Council conducts its business will remain in place until such time that the MTFP is balanced, and that such controls shall be determined by the Chief Finance Officer and the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Finance and Property.

- (9) To authorise the Chief Finance Officer and Chief Executive to draw down earmarked funding to provide capacity to address and deliver the financial recovery plan and note that the Chief Finance Officer will continue to engage with expert external assistance and advice.
- (10) To endorse the proposal to develop an asset disposal strategy to optimise the revenue impact from the divestment (via sale or otherwise) of the Council's assets and address the need to pay off debt, utilising external advice and support to ensure that best value returns are achieved.
- (11) To agree that a revised Medium-Term Financial Plan be brought to the Executive and Council in October 2023 and then reported quarterly to the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee.

Reason:

To enable the Council to set a balanced budget, which is a statutory requirement and a robust Medium-Term Financial Plan.

Comments:

Councillor James Walsh

9. APPOINTMENTS TO EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS 2023-27 (Pages 71 – 116 of the Council agenda)

Update on nominations in respect of contested appointments:

- **Guildford Poyle Charities**

Councillor Ruth Brothwell has withdrawn her nomination. This means that Councillor Amanda Creese will be appointed to Guildford Poyle Charities. Councillor Brothwell will remain as trustee filling another vacancy.

- **Royal Surrey County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust**

Councillors were invited on 14 July to submit nominations in respect of the appointment of a governor to the Royal Surrey County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust. The deadline for submission of nominations was Friday 21 July. The following councillors submitted completed person profiles in respect of this appointment, copies of which were circulated to all councillors on 21 July:

- Councillor David Bilbé
- Councillor Honor Brooker
- Councillor Merel Rehorst-Smith

Councillor Bilbé has since withdrawn his nomination.

- **Yvonne Arnaud Theatre Management Ltd & Yvonne Arnaud Theatre Trust**
Councillor Honor Brooker has withdrawn her nomination. This means that Councillor Steven Lee will be appointed, with Councillor Brooker appointed as deputy.

Details of the remaining contested ‘Council appointments’ and the respective nominees are set out in detail in Appendix 3 to the report and summarised below. Each nominee has been given the opportunity to make either a written or an oral personal statement to the meeting in support of their nomination before the vote is taken, with any oral statement taking no longer than three minutes. The only written personal statement received was from Councillor Yves de Contades (see below). The Mayor will invite all other nominees to make an oral personal statement.

1 Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee:

- Councillor Yves de Contades

Personal statement:

“I have put myself forward for the role of councillor representative for Farnborough Aerodrome as I have 30 years of experience in international travel consultancy, journalism and publishing, including private jet travel.

My range of contacts in the travel and luxury industry, both UK and international is extensive.

I have covered most of the private aerodromes around London and the South and indeed written about and interviewed many of the directors of the leading private air and helicopter charter companies, so I am well versed in the aviation industry and working practices.

Hopefully this knowledge can be put to good use serving residents, the council and Farnborough Aerodrome”.

- Councillor Geoff Davis

2 Guildford Action for Community Care:

- Councillor Bilal Akhtar
- Councillor Cait Taylor

3 Oakleaf Enterprise

- Councillor Bilal Akhtar
- Councillor Angela Goodwin

4 Royal Surrey County Hospital NHS Foundation Trust – Council of Governors

- Councillor Honor Brooker
- Councillor Merel Rehorst-Smith

5 Watts Gallery (Limnerslease Management Committee)

- Councillor Honor Brooker
- Councillor Danielle Newson

Personal statement:

“I am applying for this role with Watts Gallery as someone with a strong interest in the Arts and Sculpture. To those who do not know me, I am a Clinical Negligence lawyer who defends the NHS trusts.

I was the first person in my family to go to University and did so after obtaining a Scholarship to a Public School. I believe in inclusivity and opportunity for all.

Education is a key part of this.

To give some context, my father was brought up in poverty in the East End of London post war and went to a local grammar school. He got out of the East End by going into the Fleet Air Arm and became a Fast Jet pilot. One of his cousins won a Scholarship to the Blackheath Conservatoire to study music where he learnt piano. He was an Avant Garde composer and photographer. Feel free to Google George Newson!

He was not a successful composer and earned more money from his photography than his music and some 50 portraits taken by him are in the National Portrait Gallery in London.

Uncle George, as we called him, was close to my father and we spent much of our childhoods together. I saw how artistic communities rely on each other for support during good and bad times. For instance, we had a local sculptor chop our wood in return for a meal. They lived near other local artists who often posed for the portraits as they all supported each others’ artistic endeavours.

They were a largely contented group of people. I do not think of artists solely as successful people but part of a group collaboration. George's sons had a more practical approach to the Arts and became Film and TV editors working on Saving Private Ryan, Endeavour and Minder.

I am wholly committed to Watts Gallery's work as a charity to endeavour to reach and inspire all audiences through their collection and exhibitions, programming, contemporary art projects and community engagement.

I would love to be involved in reviewing activities taking place at Limnerslease and expanding their audience.

I fully understand the need to review the plan for the restoration and development of Limnerslease and its gardens and grounds with an interest in the protection of the property and grounds of the wider Watts Gallery Trust estate.

My background in Law means I have a basic understanding of Trust and Charity Law which will be helpful. I hope to be appointed and welcome other Councillors to see the work that we are doing at Watts Gallery".

Voting on contested appointments:

In respect of each appointment, a vote by way of show of hands will be taken for each nominee. If there is an equal number of votes for each nominee, the appointment shall be decided by the Mayor's casting vote.

Each appointee's term of office will run until May 2027. Where permissible under the relevant external organisation's constitution/standing orders, the unsuccessful nominee will, if they wish, be the deputy to the appointee.

10. APPOINTMENT OF PARISH MEMBERS TO THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE & STANDARDS COMMITTEE (Pages 117 – 126 of the Council agenda)

The outcome of the ballot of all parish councils in respect of the four nominations received for appointment of up to three parish members as co-optees to the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee, which ran from 23 June to 21 July 2023, was as follows:

Nominee:	Total no. of votes cast by parish councils:
Julia Osborn (Send PC)	13
Simon Schofield (Normandy PC)	8
Penny Tompkins (Shere PC)	8
Tim Wolfenden (Shalford CC)	11

NB. The turnout was 61% (14 of the 23 parish councils in the borough having voted).

As stated in paragraph 1.6 of the report, Article 10 of the Constitution states that the result of the ballot shall inform the Council's decision as to the co-option of parish members to the Committee.

The motion:

The Lead Councillor for Regulatory and Democratic Services, Councillor Merel Rehorst-Smith to propose, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane to second the following motion:

“That, taking into account the outcome of the ballot of parish councils and their respective personal statements, the Council appoints Julia Osborn and Tim Wolfenden as co-opted parish members of the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee for a term of office expiring in May 2027.”

Reason:

To ensure the composition of the Committee includes up to three co-opted parish members in accordance with Article 10 of the Council's Constitution.

In relation to the third appointment, councillors will note that Simon Schofield and Penny Tompkins both received 8 votes from parish councils.

The Council will therefore need to take a separate vote on this appointment taking into account their respective personal statements, which are attached as Appendix 1 to the report to the Council.

Comments:

None

11. MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE (Pages 127 - 146 of the Council agenda)

To receive and note the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 16 March, 20 March, and 22 June 2023 which are attached to the Council agenda.

Comments:

None

12. NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 13 JULY 2023: 7 DAY PLANNING NOTIFICATION PROCEDURE (pages 5 and 6 of the Council Agenda)

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Bob Hughes to propose, and Councillor Richard Mills to second, the following motion:

“Council notes that on 22nd February 2023, the Council voted to remove the Member reference process known as the 7-day procedure. This decision removed a key part of democratic decision making from the planning process.

Council further notes that the decision was taken without any consultation of the public, or Parish Councils. It is likely that many including newly elected Councillors will believe that this Ward Councillor consultation process is still in place as it is still happening with older planning applications.

Therefore, this Council resolves to:

- (1) Reinstate the Member reference process (7-day procedure).
- (2) Apply the process to all current applications which are still to be determined following the decision taken by the Council on 22nd February 2023”.

Comments:

None

13. NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 13 JULY 2023: NORTH STREET (pages 6 and 7 of the Council Agenda)

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Matt Furniss to propose, and Councillor Richard Mills to second, the following motion:

“North Street

Background

Create Streets is an organisation that exists to help solve the housing crisis and to help neighbourhood, communities, landowners, councils and developers create and manage beautiful, sustainable places of gentle density that will be popular, are likely to be correlated with good wellbeing and public health outcomes and which are likely to prove good long-term investments based on the historical data of value appreciation and maintenance costs.

Create Streets was appointed by Surrey County Council to design The Healthy Streets for Surrey Guide, using their expertise to co-create beautiful, sustainable, prosperous, economically and socially successful places with strong local support.

On 25 October 2022, Surrey County Council’s Cabinet endorsed The Healthy Streets for Surrey Guide and agreed adoption of the guide as County Council policy for the design of streets in all new developments in the county. The digital version is now live <https://healthystreets.surreycc.gov.uk/> .

It is design guidance to create healthier and more sustainable streets for residents by prioritising air quality, physical activity and community wellbeing. The guidance discusses ways to achieve sustainable streets, such as developing safer walking and cycling routes, promoting public transport, and engaging with local communities.

Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities showcased The Healthy Streets for Surrey Guide on 22 June as one of the 25 Pathfinder Councils for showing leadership at the local level. By using design codes, we will enter a virtuous cycle of regenerative development. Design coding is a linchpin in Government’s ambitions for changes to the planning system. It is proposed to be mandatory for all local authorities in the Levelling-Up and Regeneration Bill. Associated themes of placemaking and beautiful and sustainable design are already embedded in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Therefore, this Council resolves to:

- (1) Appoint Create Streets to act as a ‘critical friend’ to review and make recommendations on the new North Street application submitted by St Edwards to the Council.
- (2) Add their comments to the appealed scheme which can be used in the Council’s evidence to defend the appeal.
- (3) Ask the Executive to endorse Surrey County Council’s Healthy Streets for Surrey Guide.”

Comments:

None

* * * * *

Appendix 1

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL
MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND THEIR PORTFOLIO RESPONSIBILITIES

Councillor	Areas of Responsibility
<p>Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Housing Councillor Julia McShane</p>	Homelessness, Housing Advice, Landlord Services, Housing Maintenance and Repairs.
<p>Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Regeneration Councillor Tom Hunt</p>	Corporate Capital Projects, Housing Delivery, Regeneration, Economic Development and Transport.
<p>Lead Councillor for Engagement and Customer Services Councillor Angela Goodwin</p>	Communications and Engagement, Complaints, Ombudsman, Customer services, Case Management, Digital services, Freedom of Information, ICT and Business Systems.
<p>Lead Councillor for Commercial Development Services* Councillor Catherine Houston (* the portfolio title was changed by the Leader as indicated on 29 June)</p>	Building Control, Events, Heritage, Leisure and Off-Street Parking.
<p>Lead Councillor for Finance and Property Councillor Richard Lucas</p>	Finance and Accounting (General Fund/ Housing Revenue Account), Internal Audit, Procurement, Revenues and Benefits, Property and Land Assets, Engineers and Facilities.

Councillor	Areas of Responsibility
<p>Lead Councillor for Community and Organisational Development</p> <p>Councillor Carla Morson</p>	<p>Careline, Community Grants, Community Safety including Community Safety Partnership, Disabled Facilities Grants, Adaptations, Family Support, Health, Safeguarding, Supporting Vulnerable people, migrants and refugees, Business Transformation, HR, Learning and Development, Payroll, Strategy, Policy and Performance, Programme Assurance, Risk Management and Business Continuity.</p>
<p>Lead Councillor for Planning, Environment, and Climate Change</p> <p>Councillor George Potter</p>	<p>Planning Applications, Planning Enforcement, Planning Integration and Improvement, Planning Policy, Bereavement, Green Spaces, Parks, Countryside, Trees, Fleet Operations, Street Cleaning, Waste and Recycling and Climate Change.</p>
<p>Lead Councillor for Regulatory and Democratic Services</p> <p>Councillor Merel Rehorst-Smith</p>	<p>Air Quality, Corporate Health and Safety, Emergency Planning, Environmental Health/Crime, Food Safety, Licensing, Private Sector Housing, Democratic Services, Elections, Executive and Civic Support, GDPR, Information Security, Governance, Legal, Overview and Scrutiny Support.</p>

as agreed December 2022

2023-24 (assume uplift 6% - includes pay award and increment)-		
cost		
Interim (covering Development Management (Applications) Lead)- fixed term to Oct 2023- £65ph- assumed 37 hours pw/4 weeks leave	86,580.00	DM
Interim (covering Development Management (Majors) Lead)- assume fixed term to year end- £60ph/37 hours pw/ 4 weeks leave	97,680.00	DM
Scanning Officer (bottom of band 2- sp 10)- permanent	32,520.00	C,C &P
Scanning Officer (bottom of band 2- sp 10)- permanent	32,520.00	C,C &P
Caseworker (bottom of band 3- sp 14)- permanent	35,380.00	C,C &P
Senior Planning Officer (mid band 6- sp 29)- fixed to end of December 2023	41,415.00	DM
Principal planner (mid point band 7- sp 36)- fixed to end December 2023	49,080.00	DM
Principal planner (mid point band 7- sp 36)- fixed term for two year (costs to be recouped from PPA income) to year end	65,430.00	DM
Assistant Planning officer x3 (mid band 4- sp 19)- fixed term to end Oct	71,340.00	DM
	511,945.00	
saving		
Development Management (Applications) Lead- vacancy to end October-(just DEVCON)	(70,020)	DM
Development Management (Majors) Lead vacancy to year end (just DEVCON)	(72,820)	DM
	(142,840)	
net cost	369,105.00	

Total required 2023-24 with assumptions for agency (£85,000) and casuals (£34,000)	488,105.00
DM 2023-24	387,700.00
C,C & P 2023-24	100,400.00

new structure proposal

203-24 (assume 5% uplift)		salary plus on costs
cost		
DM Manager (top band 10)- permanent		100,302 DM
Scanning Officer (bottom of band 2- sp 10)- permanent		32,520 C,C &P
Scanning Officer (bottom of band 2- sp 10)- permanent		32,520 C,C &P
Caseworker (bottom of band 3- sp 14)- permanent		35,380 C,C &P
Business & Performance Manager		41,600 DM
Team Leader (top of band 9)- permanent		82,891 DM
Principal Planner (top of band 7)- permanent		129,839 DM
Planning Officer (top of band 4)- permanent		41,548 DM
Project Manager (top of band 4)- permanent		41,548 DM
		538,147

total required 2023-24 with assumptions for agency (£120,000) and casuals (£34,000)	692,100.00	shortfall
DM 2023-24	591,700	204,000
C,C & P 2023-24	100,400	0

this is assuming that all fixed term posts are no longer required in 2023-24, that all agency requirements are covered by £120,000 and that existing Lead posts x 2 are filled

This page is intentionally left blank