

## STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

Tuesday 21 July, 2020

The decisions summarised below were taken by the Executive at the above-mentioned meeting and, subject to the call-in procedure referred to in Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17 and to the Notes at the end of this document, shall have effect five working days after the meeting. Details of any recommendations to Council are also included for completeness.

### Members of the Executive

Chairman:

\*Councillor Caroline Reeves

(Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Housing and Development Control)

Vice-Chairman:

\*Councillor Joss Bigmore

(Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Service Delivery)

\*Councillor Tim Anderson, (Lead Councillor for Resources)

\*Councillor Jan Harwood, (Lead Councillor for Climate Change)

\*Councillor Julia McShane, (Lead Councillor for Community)

\*Councillor John Redpath, (Lead Councillor for Economy)

\*Councillor John Rigg, (Lead Councillor for Regeneration)

\*Councillor James Steel, (Lead Councillor for Environment)

\*Present

Councillors Christopher Barrass, Chris Blow, Dennis Booth, Angela Goodwin, Angela Gunning, Ramsey Nagaty, Susan Parker, George Potter, Maddy Redpath, Deborah Seabrook, Pauline Searle, Paul Spooner and Fiona White were also in attendance.

### **Agenda Item No.**

### **Officer**

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **2. LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST**

There were no disclosures of interest.

#### **3. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2020 were confirmed as a correct record.

#### 4. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader announced that Surrey County Council had recently set out plans to seek government approval to create a single unitary authority in Surrey. This move was described by the Leader as extremely disappointing since there had not been discussion with borough and district leaders across the county in spite of detailed discussion with all Surrey MPs.

The Leader's understanding, based upon correspondence from the Leader of Surrey County Council, was that a draft business case would be submitted to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) by the end of September. Whilst the Borough Council had been promised stakeholder engagement, the Leader expressed concern for Guildford residents given that there had yet to be any consultation with district and borough councils, let alone with residents given the very tight timetable that had been proposed.

The Leader agreed that devolution to unitary authorities was the most appropriate way to deal with the serious funding issues that all authorities faced, particularly in the post-pandemic period. The advantages of working or joining with neighbouring authorities were recognised, but there was a serious question to face with regard to the size of a single authority across the whole county. The Leader had particular concern for the impact on Guildford residents of such a large organisation both in terms of service provision and connection with their elected councillors.

The understanding was that unitary status for Surrey would create an authority covering 1.2 million people which was nearly double the size of any English unitary in existence, compared to a government preference for such authorities covering populations of 400,000.

#### 5. \* CLIMATE EMERGENCY RESPONSE: ACTIONS FOR ACHIEVING NET-ZERO CARBON

RESOLVED to adopt the draft Action Plan as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive.

Alex Swainson

##### Reason

In response to the Council's Climate Emergency Declaration, to adopt a high-level action plan (incorporating the Energy Delivery Framework) for working towards net-zero carbon within the Council's operations and playing our part in delivering more extensive and progressive carbon reductions across the borough.

##### Alternative options considered and rejected by the Executive

None

##### Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader or lead councillors and any dispensation granted

None

**6. \* PUBLIC HEALTH FUNERAL POLICY**

RESOLVED to adopt the draft Public Health Funeral Policy as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive. Justine Fuller

Reason

To ensure that Public Health Funerals are conducted in a fair and transparent way and that the deceased's estate is managed in line with the current legislation and guidance

Alternative options considered and rejected by the Executive

1. Modify and adopt a version of Appendix 1 the Council's Public Health Funeral Policy.
2. Reject the draft policy as there is no statutory requirement for the Council to have a Public Health Funeral Policy.

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader or lead councillors and any dispensation granted

None.

**7. \* STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (SDF) SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

RESOLVED:

1. To adopt, as a Local Development Document, the Strategic Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive.
2. To authorise the Policy Lead - Planning Policy, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Climate Change, to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document as they may deem necessary.

Stuart  
Harrison

Reasons

The recommendation under (1) will enable the adoption of the SPD as a Local Development Document and will add weight to this guidance as a material consideration in the assessment of relevant planning applications.

The recommendation under (2) allows for minor modifications to the SPD should they be necessary prior to publication.

Alternative options considered and rejected by the Executive

To refer the matter to the Joint Executive Advisory Board for further consideration.

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader or lead councillors and any dispensation granted

None.

## 8. \* GUILDFORD ECONOMIC REGENERATION PROGRAMME

### RESOLVED:

1. To set up a Guildford Economic Regeneration Programme Masterplan Board to be chaired by the Lead Councillor for Regeneration.
2. To adopt the draft Guildford Economic Regeneration Strategy and draft structure organisational plan as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 to the report submitted to the Executive.
3. To appoint an external specialist advisor and professional team with the responsibility to deliver a strategy specifically for the regeneration of Guildford town centre.

Michael Lee-  
Dickson

### Reasons

1. This programme has major benefits for Guildford's community and businesses by delivering a pro-active strategy to address the economic and physical constraints facing the town, including the retail downturn and the impact of the COVID19 situation.
2. To support resolution CO29 of the Council made 23 July 2019.

### Alternative options considered and rejected by the Executive

To not endorse the programme and cease work thereby delaying the delivery of a strategy for the Economic Regeneration of Guildford town centre.

### Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader or lead councillors and any dispensation granted

None.

### NOTES:

- (a) Any decision marked “#” means that the item was deemed by the Managing Director and agreed by the Executive and Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be a matter of urgency for the reason indicated and, in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17 (h), such decision takes effect immediately and is therefore *not* subject to the call-in procedure.
- (b) The call-in procedure is as follows:
  - (i) the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; or
  - (ii) a minimum of five members of the Councilmay require that a decision be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for review.
- (c) Councillors wishing to exercise their right to call-in a decision taken by the Executive must give notice in writing to the Democratic Services and Elections Manager. The reason for a councillor calling-in a decision shall accompany any such request and must meet one of the following criteria:
  - (a) that there was insufficient, misleading or inaccurate information available to the decision-maker;
  - (b) that all the relevant facts had not been taken into account and/or properly assessed;
  - (c) that the decision is contrary to the budget and policy framework and is not covered by urgency provisions; or

- (d) that the decision is not in accordance with the decision-making principles set out in the Constitution.

Such notice should be marked for the attention of John Armstrong who can be contacted by e-mail on [john.armstrong@guildford.gov.uk](mailto:john.armstrong@guildford.gov.uk)

- (d) On receipt of a call-in request, the Monitoring Officer will decide, in consultation with the chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, whether it is valid and will notify the councillors concerned accordingly.
- (e) In the case of a valid call-in, the decision shall be referred to a special Call-in meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, which shall be held within 21 days of the decision on validity referred to in paragraph (d) above.
- (f) A decision marked with an asterisk denotes that the matter is a “Key Decision” which is defined in the Council’s Constitution as an executive decision:
  - (i) which is likely to result in significant expenditure or savings (of at least £200,000) having regard to the budget for the service or function to which the decision relates; or
  - (ii) which is likely to have a significant impact on two or more wards within the Borough.