



[www.guildford.gov.uk](http://www.guildford.gov.uk)

Contact Officer:

John Armstrong  
Democratic Services and Elections Manager  
Tel: (01483) 444102

12 July 2021

Dear Councillor

Your attendance is requested at a meeting of the **EXECUTIVE** to be held in the Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on **TUESDAY, 20 JULY 2021** at 7.00 pm.

Yours faithfully

James Whiteman  
Managing Director

**MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

Chairman:  
Councillor Joss Bigmore  
(Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Service Delivery)

Vice-Chairman:  
Councillor Jan Harwood  
(Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Climate Change)

Councillor Tim Anderson, (Lead Councillor for Resources)  
Councillor Tom Hunt, (Lead Councillor for Development Management)  
Councillor Julia McShane, (Lead Councillor for Community and Housing)  
Councillor John Redpath, (Lead Councillor for Economy)  
Councillor John Rigg, (Lead Councillor for Regeneration)  
Councillor James Steel, (Lead Councillor for Environment)

**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.

**QUORUM 3**

## THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

### Vision – for the borough

For Guildford to be a town and rural borough that is the most desirable place to live, work and visit in South East England. A centre for education, healthcare, innovative cutting-edge businesses, high quality retail and wellbeing. A county town set in a vibrant rural environment, which balances the needs of urban and rural communities alike. Known for our outstanding urban planning and design, and with infrastructure that will properly cope with our needs.

### Three fundamental themes and nine strategic priorities that support our vision:

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>Place-making</b> | Delivering the Guildford Borough Local Plan and providing the range of housing that people need, particularly affordable homes |
|                     | Making travel in Guildford and across the borough easier   |
|                     | Regenerating and improving Guildford town centre and other urban areas   |
| <b>Community</b>    | Supporting older, more vulnerable and less advantaged people in our community  |
|                     | Protecting our environment   |
|                     | Enhancing sporting, cultural, community, and recreational facilities   |
| <b>Innovation</b>   | Encouraging sustainable and proportionate economic growth to help provide the prosperity and employment that people need       |
|                     | Creating smart places infrastructure across Guildford  |
|                     | Using innovation, technology and new ways of working to improve value for money and efficiency in Council services             |

### Values for our residents

- We will strive to be the best Council.
- We will deliver quality and value for money services.
- We will help the vulnerable members of our community.
- We will be open and accountable.
- We will deliver improvements and enable change across the borough.

## AGENDA

### ITEM NO.

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

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

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 - 18)**

The draft minutes of the last formal meeting of the Executive held on 20 April 2021 are attached, together (for information) with the respective statements of executive decisions taken by the Leader on 25 May, by the Deputy Leader in the absence of the Leader on 22 June, and by the Leader on 6 July 2021.

#### **4 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

#### **5 COMMUNITY SPONSORSHIP PROGRAMMES (Pages 19 - 24)**

#### **6 \*PRIORITY LIST OF HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORT SCHEMES CRITICAL TO LOCAL PLAN DELIVERY (Pages 25 - 44)**

#### **7 ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2020-21 (Pages 45 - 66)**

#### Key Decisions:

Any item on this agenda that is marked with an asterisk is a key decision. The Council's Constitution defines a key decision as an executive decision which is likely to result in expenditure or savings of at least £200,000 or which is likely to have a significant impact on two or more wards within the Borough.

Under Regulation 9 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, whenever the Executive intends to take a key decision, a document setting out prescribed information about the key decision including:

- the date on which it is to be made,
- details of the decision makers,
- a list of the documents to be submitted to the Executive in relation to the matter,
- how copies of such documents may be obtained

must be available for inspection by the public at the Council offices and on the Council's website at least 28 clear days before the key decision is to be made. The relevant notice in respect of the key decisions to be taken at this meeting was published as part of the Forward Plan on 17 June 2021.

## EXECUTIVE

20 April 2021

- \* Councillor Joss Bigmore (Chairman)
- \* Councillor Jan Harwood (Vice-Chairman)

- |                            |                           |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| * Councillor Tim Anderson  | * Councillor John Redpath |
| * Councillor Tom Hunt      | * Councillor John Rigg    |
| * Councillor Julia McShane | * Councillor James Steel  |

\*Present

Councillors Chris Blow, Colin Cross, Angela Goodwin, Nigel Manning, Ramsey Nagaty, Deborah Seabrook, and Paul Spooner were in attendance.

### **EX92 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **EX93 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **EX94 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2021 were confirmed as correct record. The Chairman signed the minutes.

### **EX95 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader welcomed the reopening of retail and hospitality outlets and encouraged residents to support local businesses to recover from lockdown.

A walk-in test centre would open from Wednesday 21 April in the Council Offices at Millmead. The centre would be located in the staff canteen and would provide testing Monday to Friday from 8am until 7.30pm. Free car parking would be available in front of Millmead house, but entry would be via the side entrance, not via reception.

Following the Council's agreement to review the Local Plan with a view to updating it, work would commence shortly to identify and gather evidence and the project plan would be shared publicly as soon as possible.

### **EX96 URGENT DECISION - GRANT OF PROTECTED LEASE OF LAND AT MIDLETON INDUSTRIAL ESTATE TO UKPN FOR A SUB-STATION**

Midleton Industrial Estate was being redeveloped in four phases, with a total of 37 new industrial units being constructed. To meet the power requirements for the development, a new sub-station was required for the site. UK Power Networks (UKPN) had been instructed by the Council to install the sub-station for the development. However, before this could be installed a lease was required between the Council and UKPN.

The lease would allow UKPN to install and maintain a sub-station on behalf of the Council. The installation had been paid for by the Council at a cost of £132,000 and the supply would only be for the benefit of the Council's development and the industrial units that were being constructed.

The lead-in time for construction of the sub-station was 34 weeks and work would only begin when the lease had been agreed. The Managing Director had taken an urgent decision under powers within the scheme of delegation to grant a lease to UKPN for 99 years at a peppercorn rent, which would allow rights of access to and from the sub-station.

The Executive

RESOLVED: That the use by the Managing Director of his urgent decision powers, in consultation with the Leader and the Monitoring Officer, on 26 March 2021 to approve the grant of a 99 year lease at a peppercorn to UKPN in respect of a small plot of land at the Midleton Industrial Estate, Guildford, be noted.

Reasons:

The approval of the new lease to UKPN provided a power supply and allowed the development to continue on schedule ensuring that there were no increased development costs caused by the delayed installation of the sub-station.

**EX97 GUILDFORD SPECTRUM REFURBISHMENT SURVEYS**

The Guildford Spectrum Leisure Complex was a unique and complex building offering a range of sports and leisure facilities. It was noted the complex had been visited around 45 million times. The venue's original life cycle was expected to be 40-50 years and at 28 years old a revised strategy for its ongoing repair or replacement was required. The venue was the greatest single carbon emissions contributor within the Council's property portfolio because of the nature of the facilities on site. The impact of Covid 19 in particular and future implications had necessitated a review of all options in respect of the long-term future of the existing building.

Funding of £300,000 originally set aside in 2019 to explore the feasibility of replacing the building remained available since that option was not presently being pursued. The Executive considered a report seeking approval for the transfer of that funding to undertake a range of specialist surveys to assess the anticipated life span of the venue (including the building fabric, the mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems) and what programme of investment might be required to extend the life expectancy of the building and plant. In addition, the surveys would identify opportunities to reduce carbon emissions and update the operational technology of the venue. Two part-time fixed-term members of staff in Asset Management and Corporate Programmes would coordinate the procurement of the surveys and the ultimate consolidation of the data into a report for councillors. Thereafter, there could be a need for further senior specialist external advice associated with the consolidation of the diverse data sources.

The Chairman of the Service Delivery Executive Advisory Board informed the meeting that the recommendations as set out for the Executive were supported by the EAB when considered previously.

The Executive requested that the reports and recommendations arising from the studies should be accessible with clear options for the Council to consider.

The Executive

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the spending of £300,000 from the carry forward reserve to enable the collection of comprehensive survey data on the existing venue, be approved.
- (2) That the procurement of a range of surveys from suitably qualified specialists, as detailed in paragraph 3.9 (a) to (h) inclusive of the report submitted to the Executive, be approved.

(3) That the appointment of two fixed-term part-time positions to facilitate this stage of the project, be approved.

Reasons:

This proposed collection of survey data is much more comprehensive than any survey process previously undertaken in respect of the venue. This will allow councillors to make an informed decision about the remaining lifespan of the existing facility and whether that lifespan can be effectively extended, and if so, for how long, within acceptable economic parameters. Any decision to refurbish such an important venue for the community must be made on the best available information as the investment to significantly extend the life of venue is likely to be substantial.

The meeting finished at 7.34 pm

Signed .....

Chairman

Date .....

## STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

Tuesday, 25th May, 2021

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 Joss Bigmore

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

Vice-Chairman:

\*Councillor Jan Harwood

(Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Climate Change)

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

\*Councillor Tom Hunt, (Lead Councillor for Development Management)

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

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

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

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

\*Present

Councillors Chris Blow, Angela Goodwin, Diana Jones, Nigel Manning, Ramsey Nagaty, George Potter, Tony Rooth, Deborah Seabrook, Paul Spooner were also in attendance.

### **Agenda Item No.**

### **Officer(s) to action Item**

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

There were no apologies for absence.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **3. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 April 2021 would be confirmed when the Executive next met collectively.

#### **4. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader provided an update regarding the Covid pandemic locally. There had been reports of surge testing in the area. There had been a small number of cases of the Indian variant of Coronavirus in North-East Hampshire. Hampshire County Council were leading on testing and as a precaution had extended the offer of tests to those on the Surrey-Hampshire border in the GU12 postcode, in Ash and Ash Vale. Those



who lived or worked in the GU12 postcode district of the borough who did not have Coronavirus symptoms could book a test from 26 May until 9 June. Information was available on the Council's social media pages and Hampshire County Council's website with details of how to book a test at sites in Aldershot, Farnborough, Fleet or Blackwater.

Surrey County Council's Symptom-Free Test Centre at Millmead was being closed on Friday, 28 May as residents preferred to test at home. Home Test kits were available from local pharmacies or could be ordered online.

The Leader reported that the paddling pool in Stoke Park had reopened in time for half-term. Safety measures were in place with visits of no more than one hour requested so as to avoid crowds.

Guildford Museum was reopening from midday on Wednesday 26 May and would be open Wednesday to Saturday each week, from 12pm until 4.30pm. Entry was free.

A new exhibition celebrated Guildford's most famous artist, Georgian portrait painter to the Royal Family, John Russell.

The Farmers' Market was back on the High Street from Tuesday 1 June, from 10.30am – 3.30pm with lots of delicious local produce. Safety measures would remain in place to help to protect visitors and stallholders.

**5. SURREY LEADERS' GROUP NOMINATIONS 2021-22**

John  
Armstrong

Decision:

The Leader noted the report with no further action required, although he would consider any late nominations up to the deadline of 8 June 2021.

Reason(s):

There were no councillor nominations received for the vacancies.

Other options considered and rejected by the Leader:

None

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the leader and any dispensation granted:

None

**6. URGENT DECISION ON THE GRANT OF TWO LICENCES OVER THE FORMER STAFF RESTAURANT AND CIVIC SUITE AT MILLMEAD HOUSE, GUILDFORD, TO SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL FOR USE AS A LATERAL FLOW TEST CENTRE**

Decision:

The Leader noted that the Managing Director, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Monitoring Officer, used his urgent decision powers to grant two licences at nil consideration to Surrey County Council for use of the former staff restaurant and subsequently the Civic Suite, at Millmead House, for use as a Lateral Flow Test Facility.

Mark  
Appleton

Reason:

The approval of the new licences to Surrey County Council would provide support to the County Council in the fight against the ongoing Covid Pandemic.

Other options considered and rejected by the Leader:

None

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader and any dispensation granted:

None

**7. GUILDFORD ECONOMIC REGENERATION PROGRAMME MASTER PLAN STRATEGY \***

Decision:

Michael Lee-  
Dickson

(1) To endorse the Stage 1 report and approve proceeding to Stage 2.

(2) To transfer a capital sum of £1.1 million from provisional to the approved capital programme to enable the Council to fund fees and surveys and deliver stage 2 of the programme.

Reasons:

- 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.
- To support resolution C029 of the Council made 23 July 2019 (Notice of Motion: Town Centre Masterplanning).

Other options considered and rejected by the Leader:

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 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 Council
- may 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 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.

## STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

Tuesday, 22nd June, 2021

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 Joss Bigmore

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

Vice-Chairman:

\*Councillor Jan Harwood

(Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Climate Change)

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

\*Councillor Tom Hunt, (Lead Councillor for Development Management)

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

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

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

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

\*Present

Councillors Chris Blow, Colin Cross, Angela Goodwin, Angela Gunning, Ramsey Nagaty and Maddy Redpath were also in attendance.

### **Agenda Item No.**

### **Officer(s) to action Item**

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

Apologies for absence were received from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **3 MINUTES**

The decisions of the Leader of the Council made in consultation with the Executive on 25 May 2021 were as published.

#### **4 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Deputy Leader announced that the Surrey Heartlands Healthcare Team celebrated its one millionth Covid vaccination last week and was pleased to note that currently everyone over the age of eighteen years was now eligible to be vaccinated.

It was noted that this week was 'Armed Forces Week'. The Mayor,

Councillor Marsha Moseley, consort Councillor Nigel Manning and Armed Forces Champion Councillor Tom Hunt had all been present for the raising of the Union Flag over Guildford Castle in recognition. 'Armed Forces Day' would be held on Saturday 26 June.

**5 SHALFORD COMMON LAND MANAGEMENT**

Decision:

Hendryk Jurk

The Deputy Leader of the Council considered the consultation results and agreed:

1. The options for seven priority areas to carry out the next steps; and
2. To introduce new byelaws for Shalford Common to support the proposed actions

Reasons:

1. Compliance with the Council's statutory obligations as landowner to protect Shalford Common from encroachments in line with the Commons Act 2006 including the prevention of unauthorised parking
2. Reduction of conflicts and complaints regarding unauthorised car parking
3. Provision of car parking areas compliant with the Commons Act 2006
4. Protection of biodiversity on Shalford Common which is a designated Site of Nature Conservation Interest

Other options considered and rejected by the Deputy Leader:

None.

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Deputy Leader and any dispensation granted:

None

**6 \*SAVINGS STRATEGY 2022-23 TO 2025-26**

Claire Morris

Decision:

To approve the updated savings strategy set out in the report and Appendix 1

Reason:

To ensure the Council remains financially sustainable into the medium term.

Other options considered and rejected by the Deputy Leader:

None

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Deputy Leader and any dispensation granted:

None

## Agenda item number: 3

### 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:
- (iii) the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; or
  - (iv) a minimum of five members of the Council
- may 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.

## STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

Tuesday, 6th July, 2021

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

Vice-Chairman:

\*Councillor Jan Harwood  
(Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Climate Change)

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

\*Councillor Tom Hunt, (Lead Councillor for Development Management)

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

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

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

Councillor James Steel, (Lead Councillor for Environment)

\*Present

Councillors Chris Blow, Angela Gunning, Diana Jones, Ramsey Nagaty, Deborah Seabrook, Paul Spooner and Catherine Young were in attendance.

**Agenda  
Item No.**

**Officer(s) to  
action Item**

**1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor James Steel, Lead Councillor for Environment.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

**3 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader of the Council made no announcements.

**4 LOCAL GOVERNMENT COLLABORATION \***

Decision of the Leader:

To recommend to Full Council:

1. That Full Council agrees to pursue the option of creating a single management team with Waverley Borough Council, comprised of statutory officers (Head of Paid Service; Chief Finance Officer;

Monitoring Officer), directors and heads of service as the most appropriate means for bringing forward business cases for future collaboration.

2. That Full Council authorises the Council's Lead Specialist - HR to take the necessary action, in consultation with Waverley Borough Council and with the support and advice from South East Employers and as set out within the addendum to Appendix 3 of the report, to begin making arrangements for a recruitment and selection of a single joint Chief Executive (acting as Head of Paid Service for both Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils) in accordance with the table showing the anticipated stages in the process and approximate timelines referred to in the "Not for Publication" Appendix to the Supplementary Information Sheet circulated to councillors prior to the meeting.
3. That a report be submitted to the Council at its next meeting on 28 July 2021 on the following matters:
  - (a) heads of terms for the proposed inter-authority agreement to establish governance arrangements for joint working;
  - (b) the proposed job description and terms and conditions in respect of the appointment of a Joint Chief Executive; and
  - (c) the establishment of a joint appointments committee, including its composition and terms of reference.

Reason:

To seek direction on the next steps for collaboration with Waverley Borough Council.

Other options considered and rejected by the Leader:

Option A: To do nothing further

Option B: Commission further research with a defined scope

Option C: A shared services approach on a specific set of shared services and procurements

Option F: Single staffing team serving two democratic councils

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader and any dispensation granted:

None.

**5 WEYSIDE URBAN VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT UPDATE  
AMENDMENTS TO THE TRANSACTION WITH THAMES WATER  
AND APPROPRIATION OF LAND FOR PLANNING PURPOSES # \***

Decision of the Leader:

1. That the Managing Director be authorised, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to sign and complete the Deed of Variation to the Thames Water Agreement with Thames Water and to proceed with the implementation of the relocation of the Sewage Treatment Works and associated works.
2. That, pursuant to s122 of the Local Government Act 1972, the Council owned land shown outlined in blue on the plan at Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive be

Michael Lee-  
Dickson



appropriated for planning purposes in connection with the implementation of the Weyside Urban Village in so far as it is not already held for those purposes.

3. That it be noted and recorded that the land to be acquired by the Council from Thames Water pursuant to the Thames Water Agreement (as varied) and any further land to be acquired by the Council for, or in connection with, the Weyside Urban Village development is to be acquired pursuant to s227 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 for planning purposes to enable the implementation of the Weyside Urban Village.
4. That the call in procedure be waived in respect of the decisions referred to in paragraphs (1) to (3) above.

Reason(s):

To enable the completion of the Deed of Variation at the earliest opportunity and to ensure that there is clarity as to the powers under which, and the purposes for which, land needed for or in connection with the Weyside Urban Village is held or acquired by the Council.

Other options considered and rejected by the Leader:

None

Details of any conflict of interest declared by the Leader 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:
  - (v) the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee; or
  - (vi) 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.

### Agenda item number: 3

- (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.

Executive Report

Ward(s) affected: All

Report of Director of Service Delivery

Author: Samantha Hutchison

Tel: 01483 444285

Email: Samantha.hutchison@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Julia McShane

Tel: 01483 837736

Email: Julia.mcshane@guildford.gov.uk

Date: 20 July 2021

## Community Sponsorship Programmes

### Executive Summary

The Home Office has introduced a Community Sponsorship Scheme whereby local community groups can take responsibility to welcome and support refugees from Syria and the surrounding region directly into their communities.

This initiative complements the resettlement work undertaken by local authorities as part of the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (VPRS). The VPRS is designed to support refugee families resettle in the UK within a 5-year support window.

Guildford Borough Council (GBC) alongside Surrey County Council (SCC) and other Surrey Districts and Boroughs have been active participants in the Scheme since 2015.

At Guildford, the responsibility for the VPRS sits within the family support team in Community Services.

A local community group in Guildford – Resettle@Guildford - has prepared an application to the Home Office for Community Sponsorship of one household and seeks the Council's support in line with Home Office requirements to provide accommodation and support to resettle a vulnerable family.

Consent is needed from both SCC and GBC for any community sponsorship scheme's application. SCC have given their consent to the community sponsors Resettle@Guildford's application under delegated authority to the Executive Director of Children, Families and Lifelong Learning.

The application of Resettle@Guildford provides the opportunity to look at the governance of community sponsorship programmes more widely and hence the Executive is asked to delegate authority to the Director of Service Delivery in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Community and Housing to give consent to Resettle@Guildford and future community sponsorship applications subject to them meeting the Home Office criteria, which are set out further in the report.

In order for community sponsorship applications to proceed, the Executive is also asked to authorise the Head of Community Services to progress arrangements for consented community sponsorship with the Home Office.

**Recommendation to Executive:**

- (1) To delegate authority to the Director of Service Delivery in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Housing and Community to give consent to future community sponsorship applications as part of the vulnerable persons resettlement scheme, subject to them meeting Home Office criteria.
- (2) To authorise the Head of Community Services progress arrangements for consented community sponsorship with the Home Office and with Resettle@Guildford.

Reasons for Recommendation:

The resettlement of refugee households in Guildford adds to the diversity of the area and the household will have the opportunity in the long term to contribute to the local economy through employment and voluntary work. This results in a vibrant local economy with thriving towns and villages. The VPRS and Community Sponsorship Scheme present opportunities to promote community spirit, to encourage individuals and families to welcome and support refugee households and to be more resilient in times of need.

In granting delegated authority to the Director of Service Delivery in consultation with the Lead Councillor to give consent to community sponsors (such as Resettle@Guildford) alongside authorisation to the Head of Community Services to progress applications with the Home Office, this process can work efficiently and swiftly for the benefit of our communities.

**Is the report (or part of it) exempt from publication?**

No

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 This report seeks delegated authority for the Director of Service Delivery, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Community and Housing, to give consent to the Resettle@Guildford application for community sponsorship alongside any future community sponsors as part of the vulnerable persons resettlement scheme. subject to them meeting Home Office criteria.

**2. Strategic Priorities**

- 2.1 Community sponsorship programmes support our commitment to helping the most vulnerable in our communities and underpins our work with the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme. The scheme is specifically for the most vulnerable refugees from Syria and the surrounding area, including refugee women who are at risk and survivors of violence, children, older and disabled people and those with medical needs.

**3. Background**

- 3.1 The Home Secretary launched the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (VPRS) in January 2014 and invited all local authorities in the UK to participate. A

limited number of authorities joined, and the first refugees arrived in the UK in March 2014.

- 3.2 In response to the conflict in Syria, the Prime Minister announced on 7 September 2015 a significant extension of the VPRS to resettle up to 20,000 individual refugees over five years and requested local authorities to assist.
- 3.3 Surrey was one of the first areas in the country to give its support. Working together, the County Council, Districts and Boroughs, Health, Faith, and Voluntary Sectors have resettled over 200 refugee children and adults in Surrey under the VPRS. In Guildford, the Family Support Programme, has been commissioned to provide specialist services to meet the specific identified needs of refugee families through the scheme. These families are progressing well with improving English, children attending school, health needs being met and moving into voluntary and paid work.
- 3.4 Following the success of this scheme, the Home Office introduced a Community Sponsorship Scheme whereby local community groups can take responsibility to welcome and support refugees from Syria and the surrounding region directly into their communities. This complements resettlement work undertaken by local authorities as part of the VPRS.
- 3.5 Resettle@Guildford is a local community group that has prepared an application to the Home Office for Community Sponsorship and seeks both SCC and GBC support in line with Home Office requirements. Any prospective sponsor must obtain written evidence from the local authority that they consent to the approval of the application, and for any community sponsor in Surrey, both the County Council and relevant Borough/District Council must provide consent. However, local authorities are not responsible for assessing applications and managing the community sponsorship process as this lies with the Home Office.
- 3.6 This application has enabled us to look at the wider governance of community sponsorship schemes that may arise in Guildford. Seeking delegated authority from the Executive will enable us to help progress any future community sponsors as part of the vulnerable persons resettlement scheme subject to them meeting Home Office criteria.

#### **4. Community Sponsorship Scheme – Criteria and Responsibilities**

- 4.1 The Home Office is encouraging Community Sponsorship in response to the desire from local communities to play a greater role in refugee resettlement. Community Sponsorship enables these local community groups to take responsibility to welcome and support refugees directly into their communities and complements resettlement work already undertaken by local authorities.
- 4.2 To become a community sponsor groups must:
  - be a registered charity or Community Interest Company.
  - have secured suitable affordable accommodation for two years.
  - have at least £9,000.
  - have consent from the local authority that their application is approved in principle.
  - apply to the Home Office for their application to be approved.
- 4.3 Under the scheme a community sponsor is responsible for:

- finding a property that will be available for two years.
- providing resettlement support for one year.
- meeting a household at the airport.
- providing a warm welcome and cultural orientation.
- supporting access to medical, social, welfare, and education services
- English language tuition.
- Support towards volunteering, employment, self-sufficiency, independence and safeguarding support.

- 4.4 For any community sponsorship scheme there will be a 9-month review meeting, the Home Office will decide with the sponsors and GBC about on-going support needs of the family and how they will be met from 12 months onwards. If the sponsors end their support after one year, they must have a suitable transition plan for the family at the 12-month point and GBC will liaise with them at the end of 12 months to consider if the family requires additional support.
- 4.5 Direct funding after 12 months is available for GBC to claim but will be determined on a case-by-case basis. Funding may also be available in the event that new support needs arise which cannot be met by the sponsors or they feel unable to sustain support. However, in the case of Resettle@Guildford, they have given no indication that they will be unable to see out their sponsorship and intend to remain on a voluntary basis in a supporting role with the household.
- 4.6 All sponsors have to confirm the suitability of their Safeguarding Policy with lead officers at Surrey's Safeguarding Boards for both Children and Adults and make contact with local schools in respect of available school places and Surrey County Council officers have confirmed that places are likely to be available.

## **5. Consultations**

- 5.1 There has been no external consultation to this report. Colleagues from the Children, Families and Lifelong learning Directorate in SCC have liaised with the Head of Community Services at GBC and agreed that all paperwork and governance is in place with Resettle@Guildford. Our private sector services team has also inspected the property which will accommodate the family if the Home Office approve and confirm it meets all necessary standards. This would be done for every sponsorship application.

## **6. Equality and Diversity Implications**

- 6.1 The Equalities Impact Assessment undertaken by the Home Office and SCC identifies positive impacts. The VPRS is specifically for the most vulnerable refugees from Syria and surrounding areas, including refugee women who are at risk and survivors of violence, children, older and disabled people and those with medical needs. It aims to protect refugees at risk due to their sexual orientation or gender identity. The Neighbourhood Police are notified of households that are resettled and should any negative incidents occur they will be notified along with the Surrey Prevent Team.

## **7. Financial Implications**

- 7.1 Financial assistance is provided in the form of grant assistance by the Home Office. Effectively the VPRS is cost neutral and we bear no direct cost for the VPRS. There is no short-term financial implication to the Council from the VPRS scheme, as grant funding will be received in the first year. There is also potential for Home Office

support after the first year that will alleviate any short to medium term funding pressures on the Council as the programme is designed to support families for up to 5 years. Beyond this however, the financial implication for the Council is difficult to ascertain as this will depend on public services required by resettled families and the number requiring one form of support or other.

## **8. Legal Implications**

- 8.1 There will be a legal duty for SCC to assess and provide support in respect to any special educational needs, and any adult and children social care needs. There will also be a legal duty to provide school places to children of compulsory school age.
- 8.3 As part of the process GBC is asked to support by arranging an inspection of the proposed accommodation by the Environmental Health Team which has been done and support engagement of relevant partners, such as the police, education providers, Job Centres and Clinical Commissioning Groups which we will do should the Home Office approve the application.

## **9. Human Resource Implications**

- 9.1 Support of community sponsorship programmes can be absorbed by the Head of Community Services and the Family Support Team. Currently we have one application and hence there is no impact on the service we deliver. Should far more applications be presented, we may need to review the impact on the Family Support Team.

## **10. Conclusion**

- 10.1 The Home Office is encouraging Community Sponsorship in response to the desire of local communities to play a greater role in refugee resettlement. It is a model that has been used in Canada since 1976 and has been piloted in Australia, Switzerland, Germany, and Ireland and more recently in Italy, New Zealand, and the UK.
- 10.2 Community Sponsorship enables local community groups to take responsibility to welcome and support refugees directly into their communities and complements the resettlement work that our family support team are already undertaking.
- 10.3 In approving the application and delegating authority to the Director of Service Delivery in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Community and Housing to give consent to future applications, we are enabling community sponsorship programmes to support our corporate aim of helping our most vulnerable and empowering communities to live well.

## **11. Background Papers**

[Community Sponsorship LA guidance.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#)

## **12. Appendices**

None

This page is intentionally left blank



Executive Report

Ward(s) affected: All Wards

Report of Director of Strategic Services

Author: Martin Knowles

Email: Martin.Knowles@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: John Rigg

Tel: 07870 555784

Email: John.Rigg@guildford.gov.uk

Date: 20 July 2021

## Priority List of Highway and Transport Schemes Critical to Local Plan Delivery

### Executive Summary

Corporate Programmes Team has highlighted five highway and transport schemes that are likely to be critical priorities to the Local Plan maintaining its housing trajectory and continuing to be up to date. They have been named 'priority schemes' and are in no particular order in this report.

On 11 March 2020 the government published the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2). These are prepared every five years and the latest strategy deals with funding for the period 2020-2025 but also mandates Highways England to investigate schemes that could be funded in the period 2025-2030 (RIS3).

The RIS2 does not now include an A3 Guildford scheme but does include a requirement to develop a scheme for the RIS3 pipeline known as A3/A247 Ripley south. The details of this improvement have not been formulated by Highways England and officers assume that this scheme relates in part to potential new north facing slips at the A3/A247 junction at Burnt Common.

As the A3 through Guildford scheme no longer forms part of the Government's Road Strategy Local Plan Policy ID2(2) requires the Council to review its transport evidence base to investigate the consequent cumulative impacts of approved developments and Local Plan growth including site allocations on the safe operation and the performance of the Local Road Networks and the Strategic Road Network. The final sentence of the Policy is important in that it states that "*The outcome of this review will determine whether development can continue to be completed in accordance with the Local Plan trajectory or will determine whether there needs to be a review of the Local Plan.*"

The highway and transport Schemes that are likely to be critical to the Local Plan (in no particular order) are as follows:

- SRN2 – M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange 'Road Investment Strategy' scheme

- NR2 and NR3 New rail stations at Guildford West (Park Barn) and Guildford East (Marrow)
- SMC 1-6 - Sustainable Movement Corridor
- SRN7 and SRN8 - A3 northbound on and off slip roads at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common)
- LRN19 – New road bridge and footbridge scheme to enable level crossing closure on A323 Guildford Road adjacent to Ash railway station

The Report sets out a commentary as to why we consider these schemes to be important. We have also highlighted some of the difficulties that the schemes may create in terms of wider issues that would need resolving as part of their future delivery. Some of the schemes have funding from various sources whilst other schemes have no funding.

We have also provided commentary on the highway and transport schemes that are likely to be delivered by the developers of the Strategic Sites.

We have had a meeting with Surrey County Council to discuss the priorities which they were very receptive to and supportive of and they are looking to align them with their own priorities moving forward.

We have not gone into any detail regarding the Guildford Economic Regeneration Project (GERP) in this report, but we note that there may be significant infrastructure requirements to achieve the transformational change that that Project is proposing.

The Executive is asked to approve the highway and transport infrastructure schemes set out in the Report that are considered to be priorities and therefore critical to Local Plan delivery as currently envisaged. Should the Local Plan be reviewed or amended, the list of schemes may also require amendment accordingly.

#### **Recommendation to Executive**

That the Executive approves the priority list of highway and transport schemes likely to be critical to Local Plan delivery as described in this report.

#### Reason(s) for Recommendation:

The approval of the five priority schemes will enable officers to set up regular discussions with Surrey County Council (SCC) and Highways England (HE) on transport infrastructure priorities so that progress can be made in terms of the delivery of the schemes as well as modelling the impact of the schemes in any future transport review likely to be undertaken by SCC. If SCC and HE agree to these priorities it will also assist in terms of lobbying central Government for funding towards these schemes as well as assuring that S106 contributions are made, when appropriate, as planning applications come forward, or that the Council can justify imposing a Grampian condition restricting the amount of development that can come forward in the absence of a particular scheme.

#### **Is the report (or part of it) exempt from publication?**

No

## 1 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 Corporate Programmes Team has highlighted five highway and transport schemes that are likely to be critical priorities to the Local Plan maintaining its housing trajectory and continuing to be up to date. They have been named 'priority schemes' and are in no particular order in this report.
- 1.2 The approval of the five priority schemes will enable officers to set up regular discussions with Surrey County Council (SCC) on transport infrastructure priorities so that progress can be made in terms of the delivery of the schemes as well as modelling the impact of the schemes in any future transport review likely to be undertaken by SCC. We have had a meeting with SCC to discuss these priorities and they were supportive of them. It will also assist in terms of lobbying central Government for funding towards these schemes as well as assuring that S106 contributions are made, when appropriate, as planning applications come forward, or that the Council can justify imposing a Grampian condition restricting the amount of development that can come forward in the absence of a particular scheme.

## 2. Strategic Priorities

- 2.1 Approval of this report will assist with delivering several fundamental themes of the Corporate Plan 2018-2023. In particular, under 'Place Making', approving the five priorities will assist with 'delivering the Guildford Borough Local Plan and providing the range of housing that people need, particularly affordable homes' and 'making travel in Guildford and across the borough easier'.

## 3 Background

- 3.1 The Guildford Borough Council Local Plan was adopted on 25 April 2019. The Plan covers the period 2015-2034. The section entitled Infrastructure and Delivery contains Policy ID2 which is named 'Supporting the Department for Transport's "Road Investment Strategy"'. The Policy states the following:

**POLICY ID2: Supporting the Department for Transport's "Road Investment Strategy"**

- (1) Guildford Borough Council is committed to working with Highways England to facilitate major, long-term improvements to the A3 trunk road and M25 motorway in terms of both capacity and safety, as mandated by the Department for Transport's "Road Investment Strategy". As such, promoters of sites close to the A3 and M25 and strategic sites will need to take account of any emerging proposals by Highways England or any other licenced strategic highway authority appointed by the Secretary of State under the Infrastructure Act 2015.
- (2) In the event that there is a material delay in the anticipated completion and or a reduction in scope of the A3 Guildford (A320 Stoke interchange junction to A31 Hog's Back junction) "Road Investment Strategy" scheme from that assumed in plan-making, or cancellation of the scheme, Guildford Borough Council will review its transport evidence base to investigate the consequent cumulative impacts of approved developments and Local Plan growth including site allocations on the safe operation and the performance of the Local Road Networks and the Strategic Road Network. In the case of material delay in the anticipated completion and or a reduction in scope in the A3 Guildford scheme, the review will consider the period up to the revised date of completion of the scheme. This review will be undertaken with input as appropriate from Surrey County Council and Highways England or any other licenced strategic highway authority appointed by the Secretary of State under the Infrastructure Act 2015. The outcome of this review will determine whether development can continue to be completed in accordance with the Local Plan trajectory or will determine whether there needs to be a review of the Local Plan.

- 3.2 The Reasoned Justification for the implementation of this Policy is set out below:

**Reasoned justification**

- 4.6.17 The implementation of the three RIS schemes during the Plan period, alongside other critical infrastructure, is required in order to be able to accommodate future planned growth both outside and within the borough. It is therefore important that the promoters of sites close to the A3 and M25 and strategic sites work closely with Highways England to ensure that their layout and access arrangement(s) are consistent with Highways England's emerging schemes.
- 4.6.18 The A3 Guildford scheme is subject to feasibility study and then progression through Highways England's Project Control Framework during Road Period 1. This may require consequential alterations or improvements to junctions that either connect with the Strategic Road Network or are affected by changes in traffic flows.
- 4.6.19 The evidence at the time of the Examination of the Local Plan was that, without the implementation of the A3 Guildford scheme, the cumulative impacts of the quantum and distribution of development in the Local Plan could be considered to become severe during the second half of the plan period. Nevertheless, the evidence also indicates that individually, site allocations may be able to be occupied in whole or substantial part without creating a severe impact on the Strategic Road Network as there are potential alternative transport measures that may reduce or limit the impact of additional traffic on the A3. A review will determine whether the proposed transport measures or additional transport measures can mitigate the cumulative impacts of development traffic on the A3 either during the period that the A3 Guildford scheme is delayed, in response to a reduction in its scope or in the event of its cancellation. If a review determines that transport measures are not able to mitigate a severe impact on the A3 then a review of the Local Plan is likely to be required.
- 3.3 The growth planned for in the Local Plan is contingent on the implementation of a range of major transport schemes which are set out in the Infrastructure Schedule in the Local Plan. However, some of the schemes are more important than others in terms of unlocking strategic sites.
- 3.4 At the time of the preparation of the Plan, the Road Investment Strategy 1 (RIS1) 2015-2020 had mandated Highways England to develop for the next road period an A3 Guildford scheme - improving the A3 in Guildford from the A320 to the Hogs Back junction with the A31, with associated safety improvements. The Council was not aware of the detail of the scheme at the plan preparation and it was agreed with Surrey County Council (SCC) that certain assumptions would be made in the supporting transport modelling work as to what the scheme could comprise. This included the widening of the A3 from two to three lanes in both directions from the A31 junction to the A320 junction.

**What has Changed Since the Plan was Adopted?**

- 3.5 On 11 March 2020 the government published the Road Investment Strategy 2 (RIS2). These are prepared every five years and the latest strategy deals with funding for the period 2020-2025 but also mandates Highways England to investigate schemes that could be funded in the period 2025-2030 (RIS3).
- 3.6 The RIS2 does not now include an A3 Guildford scheme but does include a requirement to develop a scheme for the RIS3 pipeline known as A3/A247 Ripley south. The details of this improvement have not been formulated by Highways

England and officers assume that this scheme relates in part to potential new north facing slips at the A3/A247 junction at Burnt Common.

- 3.7 As the A3 through Guildford scheme no longer forms part of the Government's Road Strategy, Policy ID2(2) requires the Council to review its transport evidence base to investigate the consequent cumulative impacts of approved developments and Local Plan growth including site allocations on the safe operation and the performance of the Local Road Networks and the Strategic Road Network. The final sentence is key in that it states that "*The outcome of this review will determine whether development can continue to be completed in accordance with the Local Plan trajectory or will determine whether there needs to be a review of the Local Plan.*"
- 3.8 It is noted that Policy ID2(2) requires the Council to investigate both the impacts on the safe operation and the performance of the Local and Strategic Road Network.
- 3.9 In addition, the Government published on 6 August 2020 a White Paper entitled "Planning for the Future" which if it becomes legislation will have wide reaching impacts on the planning system.

#### **Transport Evidence Base used for Local Plan**

- 3.10 The three key transport documents that formed the evidence base for the Local Plan are as follows:
- Strategic Highway Assessment for the Guildford borough Proposed Submission: Strategy and Sites (SCC, June 2016);  
<http://www.guildford.gov.uk/newlocalplan/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21342&p=0>
  - Addendum to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan "June 2016" Strategic Highway Assessment Report: High level review of potential traffic impacts of key changes in the Guildford borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites "June 2017" Guildford Borough Council, June 2017;  
<http://www.guildford.gov.uk/newlocalplan/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=24635&p=0>
  - Study of Performance of A3 Trunk Road Interchanges in Guildford Urban Area to 2024 under Development Scenarios (Mott MacDonald, April 2018).  
<http://www.guildford.gov.uk/newlocalplan/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=27376&p=0>  
and  
<http://www.guildford.gov.uk/newlocalplan/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=27505&p=0>
- 3.11 Highway and transport Schemes that are likely to be critical to the Local Plan (in no particular order).

**PRIORITY - SRN2 – M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange ‘Road Investment Strategy’ scheme**

- 3.12 This scheme is currently at Development Consent Order (DCO) application stage and has been through an Examination and the Inspectors have submitted a report to the Secretary of State (SoS). However, the SoS has delayed the decision twice on the scheme with a revised decision date of 12 November 2021 as more information and clarification is sought on environmental matters. <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/south-east/m25-junction-10a3-wisley-interchange-improvement/>
- 3.13 At a high level, the scheme involves the widening of the A3 between Ockham and Painshill junctions to four lanes, the construction of an enlarged roundabout at the A3/M25 junction and the stopping up of the majority of the access points to the A3 along the section to be widened. This includes the closure of the Wisley Lane left-in/left-out junction which serves RHS Wisley. Wisley Lane will be served by a new road on the south side of the A3 known as the Wisley Lane diversion which will connect into the Ockham roundabout junction. A new bridge will be constructed over the A3 to connect the Wisley Lane diversion to Wisley Lane.
- 3.14 In addition, the Old Lane junction which connects onto the A3 southbound slip from the A3/M25 junction will be improved to a merge which should enhance road safety and provide more capacity.
- 3.15 The Council appeared at the Examination alongside SCC and raised concerns about a number of matters, but the key concerns were the impact of additional traffic flows on B2215 Ripley and through the various rural lanes surrounding the A3. The Council and SCC requested that the scheme funds a substantial package of measures to reduce the impact of the additional traffic on Ripley High Street and we are waiting to see whether the Inspectors and the SoS agreed with the evidence submitted.
- 3.16 The proposals have been developed in part to accommodate the level of growth proposed in the Council’s Local Plan. In particular, the former Wisley Airfield site is dependent on the improvements to widen the A3 northbound and improve the northbound slip from the Ockham roundabout. Also, the improvements to Old Lane to road safety and capacity will enable some southbound trips from the site to use this junction to access the A3 rather than routing through Ripley along the B2215 to access the south facing slips at Burnt Common.
- 3.17 If the DCO is not allowed by the SoS then it will bring into question the delivery of the former Wisley Airfield housing allocation. The only potential way that this scheme could come forward would be for the developer to fund substantial improvements to the northbound carriageway of the A3 between Ockham and the A3/M25 junction, as well as improving the A3/M25 roundabout junction. This could cost tens of millions and delay the housing delivery for the site. Also, it is not known how this additional cost would affect the viability of the site.
- 3.18 This is considered to be a high priority for the Local Plan proposed level of growth because of the strategic nature of the improvement and the amount of housing it will potentially unlock.

**PRIORITY - NR2 and NR3 New rail stations at Guildford West (Park Barn) and Guildford East (Merrow)**

- 3.19 In the absence of the A3 through Guildford scheme (SRN1), it will be critical to manage down the amount of traffic generated by the strategic sites at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill to make them sustainable communities that are not reliant on car-based trips using the A3. The Council and the developers will need to demonstrate to the satisfaction of Highways England that these allocations will not have a severe impact on the safe and efficient running of the A3, particularly the section between A31 and Stoke Interchange where there are only two running lanes in each direction and there is daily congestion and road safety issues.
- 3.20 Although detailed analysis has yet to be completed, anecdotally the new rail stations would not only serve the strategic sites at Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill, thereby reducing their car borne trips but also serve the wider communities who either currently travel by car or use more distant rail stations potentially driving to park. In particular, the Guildford West station would serve the Royal Surrey County Hospital, the University of Surrey, the Surrey Research Park and the community of Park Barn which includes primary and secondary schools. Many visitors or employees of these sites use the car to access the sites and the main longer distance routes taken include the A3 through Guildford. The Guildford East Station would also serve the communities of Merrow and Burpham where the closest stations on the same line are at London Road and Clandon.
- 3.21 The land for the Council's preferred location for the Guildford West station is owned by Network Rail, Royal Surrey County Hospital (RSCH) with land on the Park Barn side owned by GBC. It is considered that RSCH would benefit greatly from a new railway station at this location due to the numbers of staff that live in the Blackwater Valley area which would be served by the station.
- 3.22 The land for the Guildford East station is owned by Network Rail, the owner of Gosden Hill and Surrey County Council (if an access is to be provided from the Merrow Depot site side).
- 3.23 These stations are therefore considered to be more strategic than just serving the sites of Blackwell Farm and Gosden Hill.

**PRIORITY - Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC1-6)**

- 3.24 This is also considered to be a high priority in the absence of the A3 through Guildford scheme (SRN1). Again, it will be critical to manage down the amount of traffic generated by the strategic sites at Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill and Weyside Urban Village to make them sustainable communities that are not reliant on car based trips using the A3. The Council and the developers will need to demonstrate to the satisfaction of Highways England that these allocations will not have a severe impact on the safe and efficient running of the A3, particularly the section between A31 and Stoke Interchange where there are only two running lanes in each direction and there is daily congestion, road safety and environmental issues.

- 3.25 The Local Plan has requirements on Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill and Weyside Urban Village to make proportionate contributions towards the delivery of SMC1 (west), SMC5 (north) and SMC6 (east). The reasoned justification for these schemes is set out in Local Plan Policy ID3:

*“4.6.25 The planning process for new developments provides the opportunity to maximise the use of the sustainable transport modes of walking, cycling, and the use of public and community transport, and opportunities for people with disabilities to access all modes of transport. This is consistent with the NPPF. For the average person cycling has the potential to substitute for short car trips, particularly under five kilometres, and walking for trips under one kilometre.*

*4.6.26 The Sustainable Movement Corridor will provide a priority pathway through the urban area of Guildford for buses, pedestrians and cyclists, serving the new communities at Blackwell Farm, SARP and Gosden Hill Farm including the new Park and Ride site, the new Guildford West (Park Barn) and Guildford East (Merrow) rail stations, the Onslow Park and Ride, both of the University of Surrey’s campuses, the town centre and Guildford rail station. The aim is for journeys to be rapid and reliable by bus and safe and direct on foot and by bike. The Sustainable Movement Corridor will be implemented in sections during the plan period, largely on existing roads and with the urban extensions at Blackwell Farm, SARP and Gosden Hill Farm, and some sites in the town centre, required to make provision for the corridor. The route sections of the proposed Sustainable Movement Corridor are listed in Appendix 6. The Council will bring forward a Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document.”*

- 3.26 Although phases of the SMC have been developed or implemented by the Council with Local Economic Partnership (LEP) funding, the rest of the routes have not been developed in any detail, with some initial feasibility work undertaken several years ago. A note was prepared for the Local Plan Inspector setting out more detail on how the SMC could work.  
<https://www.guildford.gov.uk/media/29537/GBC-LPSS-025-A-GBC-note-on-SMC-traffic-on-A3-and-Wisley-SNCI/pdf/GBC-LPSS-025-A-GBC-note-on-SMC-traffic-on-A3-and-Wisley-SNCI.pdf?m=636867962546200000>
- 3.27 The SMC has the potential to assist with managing down car usage both on the outskirts of the town where the A3 is used by local traffic but also within the town centre.
- 3.28 The SMC schemes within the town centre should be reviewed alongside the Guildford Economic Regeneration Project (GERP) as it is understood that changes to the highway network are being considered within the remit of this project and this may require the managing down of through traffic in the town centre which could be achieved in part through the SMC.



**PRIORITY - SRN7 and SRN8 - A3 northbound on and off slip roads at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common)**

- 3.29 This new infrastructure was requested by SCC as part of the Local Plan process primarily to manage the impact of the former Wisley Airfield development on B2215 through Ripley. The slip roads are proposed to remove the rat-running traffic that currently travels up to the Ockham interchange and put that traffic back on the A3 at the most appropriate point using the major road network to achieve it.
- 3.30 The scheme offers significant benefits to B2215 through Ripley and the adjacent lanes but as recognised during the examination for the Local Plan there is a potential increase in traffic through West Clandon as traffic diverts back onto the A247 rather than using the rat-running routes through the lanes. In order to mitigate this impact, the Council put forward a traffic management scheme for A247 at West Clandon known as LRN24 – A247 Clandon Road/The Street (West Clandon) traffic management and environmental improvement scheme.
- 3.31 In addition, scheme SRN2 – M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange ‘Road Investment Strategy’ will have an impact on Ripley as RHS Wisley traffic accessing from the south is predicted to travel through Ripley. Other developments in the Send area such as Garlick’s Arch are likely to add to the traffic impact. Highways England predicted in the evidence for the DCO examination that without the Burnt Common slip roads traffic flows are likely to increase on B2215 Ripley High Street by 74% between 2015 and 2037. This is due to general growth outside of GBC, GBC Local Plan growth and the SRN2 DCO scheme (Table 4.1 of Highways England 9.16 Transport Assessment Supplementary Information Report). This is clearly a significant increase that officers consider needs to be managed through the provision of the Burnt Common slips.
- 3.32 An Option Agreement has been completed with the landowners where the new slip roads would be located which has a time limit.
- 3.33 There is within RIS2 a mandate for Highways England to develop a scheme for the RIS3 pipeline known as A3/A247 Ripley south. The details of this improvement have not been formulated by Highways England and officers assume that this scheme relates to potential new north facing slips at the A3/A247 junction at Burnt Common.

**PRIORITY - LRN19 – New road bridge and footbridge scheme to enable level crossing closure on A323 Guildford Road adjacent to Ash railway station**

- 3.34 This is a scheme that is currently being developed by the Council and received planning consent in January 2021. The purpose of the scheme is to draw traffic back onto the A323 locally that currently and will in the future be rat-running along unsuitable lanes in the absence of the scheme. It also enables the development sites to be properly planned so that development traffic uses the new road bridge rather than diverting onto unsuitable lanes and roads.  
<https://www.guildford.gov.uk/ashroadbridge>

- 3.35 Importantly, it will enable the removal of a level crossing which if the sites had been developed without the bridge then the chance would have been lost, probably for good.
- 3.36 This scheme will enable the delivery of 1,750 homes in the early stages of the Local Plan.

#### **4. Developer Led Infrastructure Schemes**

- 4.1 Whilst this note picks up on the top five schemes that we consider needs intervention by the Council and which are potentially required for the delivery of the Local Plan and growth within the borough, there are a number of other schemes that should be delivered by developers as part of their strategic site allocations. In the absence of the SRN1 A3 Guildford scheme, these highway and transport infrastructure measures will be even more important to manage down as much as possible the vehicular impact from these developments. We deal with each site in turn:

##### **Former Wisley Airfield – strategic allocation (A35)**

- 4.2 The former Wisley Airfield site is likely to have the highest proportion of car users out of any strategic site due to its location next to the A3 and M25. However, there is still the opportunity to manage down the vehicular trips from the site using the requirements as set out in the Local Plan allocation:

- (5) A significant bus network to serve the site and which will also serve Effingham Junction railway station and/or Horsley railway station, Guildford and Cobham. This will be provided and secured in perpetuity to ensure that residents and visitors have a sustainable transport option for access to the site

- 4.3 A significant bus network BT2 and BT3 would provide residents with an alternative form of transport to using the car and therefore reduce the dominance of the car. The frequency of the bus services will be key to its success as will the funding mechanism and this is still under negotiation between the developer and SCC.

- (6) An off-site cycle network to key destinations including Effingham Junction railway station, Horsley railway station/Station Parade, Ripley and Byfleet to be provided with improvements to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist

- 4.4 An off-site cycle network to key destinations will also reduce the amount of car trips but this is very much seasonal and weather dependent.

##### **Gosden Hill strategic site (A25)**

- 4.5 This site is an edge of urban area site and has the potential if properly developed to be a sustainable extension to the town. The requirements in the Local Plan that will help this to be achieved are:

- An improved junction on the A3 comprising the relocated A3 southbound off-slip, a new A3 southbound on-slip and connection via a new roundabout to the A3100, with associated infrastructure on the A3100 corridor within Burpham
- 4.6 This would not only assist the development users but the community of Burpham and Merrow by providing a new southbound on-slip to the A3. Currently southbound traffic predominantly uses the Dennis' roundabout on the A25 some distance to the west of the site which means that traffic has to use the A25 and merge on the A3 where there is currently persistent congestion. Removing that merging traffic will offer a significant benefit to the A3. The only downside is that the new access to the A3 may encourage some traffic to 'junction hop' to the Stoke interchange to access Guildford.
- (2) Deliberative process of consideration to be undertaken as part of the development management process of the potential opportunity to provide an all-movements junction of the A3 trunk road with the A3100 London Road, the B2215 London Road and the A247 Clandon Road. Land could potentially be required to be safeguarded for the provision of a connector road to the B2215 London Road/A247 Clandon Road
- 4.7 A new connector road to A247 Burnt Common particularly if the north facing slip roads are built would divert a lot of traffic away from A3100 at Burpham as there would be an alternative route. However, this is likely to be a long-term strategy outside of the Local Plan period.
- (3) Land and park and ride facility of a sufficient scale as required by projected demand and in order to operate without public subsidy in perpetuity
- 4.8 This would not only serve the site and therefore reduce car usage away from the site with destinations in the town centre, but it would also capture traffic heading into the town centre from the north on the A3 which is potentially significant. The park and ride could reduce the demand for parking in the town centre and help free up the A3100 and A25 traffic corridors.
- (4) The provision of the eastern route section of the Sustainable Movement Corridor on-site, and a necessary and proportionate contribution to delivering the eastern route section off-site, having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document
- 4.9 This has previously been discussed under SMC benefits.
- (5) The provision of extended and/or new bus services to serve the site and which will also serve the eastern suburbs of Guildford and the town centre
- 4.10 This has previously been discussed under SMC benefits.

Agenda item number: 6

- (6) Permeability for pedestrians and cyclists into and from the development
- 4.11 This has previously been discussed under SMC benefits.
- (7) Land made available for Guildford East (Merrow) railway station, and necessary and proportionate contribution towards the provision of the station
- 4.12 This has previously been discussed under Guildford stations.
- (8) Other off-site highway works to mitigate the impacts of the development
- 4.13 Until the Transport Assessment has been completed, we do not know where the improvements would be located. However, the Local Plan transport assessment showed that there may need to be highway improvements along the A3100 corridor but that depends on whether Opportunity 1 is progressed.
- Opportunity – (1) Potential to provide a through route within the site to divert the B2234 to form a more direct link to the A3 at the improved junction
- 4.14 In the Strategic Sites SPD this is now a requirement to provide a southern access. Whilst it is considered by the Council and SCC to be essential for any planning application for the site, some of the wider benefits are that having an access from the south not only provides sustainable route options but also diverts traffic that is currently using New Inn Lane and A3100 to egress the A3 to a route through the site.

**Weyside Urban Village strategic site (also known as Slyfield Area Regeneration Plan A24)**

- 4.15 This site is being promoted by GBC and has a current planning application registered with GBC for determination.

**Blackwell Farm strategic site (A26)**

- 4.16 This site is similar to Gosden Hill in that it is an edge of urban area site and has the potential if properly developed to be a sustainable extension to the town. However, the site is adjacent to the most congested section of the A3. The requirements in the Local Plan that will help this site proposal to be achieved are:

- (1) Vehicular access to the site allocation will be via the existing or a realigned junction of the A31 (see Policy A27), and from the site to Egerton Road, preferably via Gill Avenue

- 4.17 See the comments on requirement (3) below.

- (3) A through vehicular link which will be controlled is required via the above accesses between the A31 Farnham Road and Egerton Road to provide a

new route for employees and emergency services to the Surrey Research Park, the University of Surrey's Manor Park campus and the Royal Surrey County Hospital, as well as a choice of vehicular access for the new residents/occupiers. This will reduce impact on the A31/A3 junction, in advance of the delivery of Highways England's A3 Guildford scheme

4.18 The benefits of the through vehicular link between A31 Farnham Road and Egerton Road are set out in the requirement above. This link has the potential to remove several hundred vehicles an hour from the section of the A3 between A31 and Egerton Road which is the most congested part of the A3 network. The removal of this traffic will also occur on Egerton Road and Gill Avenue providing some headroom to accommodate development traffic from Blackwell Farm.

- (4) The provision of the western route section of the Sustainable Movement Corridor on-site, and a necessary and proportionate contribution to delivering the western route section off-site, having regard to the Sustainable Movement Corridor Supplementary Planning Document

4.19 This has previously been discussed under SMC benefits.

- (5) The provision of extended and/or new bus services to serve the site and which will also serve the western suburbs of Guildford and the town centre

4.20 This has previously been discussed under SMC benefits.

- (6) Permeability for pedestrians and cyclists into and from the development

4.21 This has previously been discussed under SMC benefits.

- (7) Necessary and proportionate contribution towards the provision of the Guildford West (Park Barn) railway station

4.22 This has previously been discussed under Guildford stations.

- (8) Other off-site highway works to mitigate the impacts of the development

4.23 These are not known yet but would likely include improvements to Gill Avenue, Egerton Road, and the A31 Farnham Road.

#### **Other infrastructure schemes**

4.24 The above discussion does not include a number of schemes in the Infrastructure Schedule. They are schemes that will be the responsibility of stakeholders such as Network Rail, Highways England, or Surrey County Council.

4.25 Some of the smaller schemes may be delivered through S106 contributions or through the Community Infrastructure Levy when it is adopted.

## **5. Consultations**

- 5.1 The Lead Councillor, John Rigg has been consulted as have Corporate Management Team and Executive/Management Team Liaison Group. The schemes are in the Infrastructure Schedule for the Local Plan and therefore are publicly available already. No public consultation has taken place on the priorities set out in this report.

## **6. Key Risks**

- 6.1 The key risks are that funding is not currently available for some of the schemes being prioritised in this report and stakeholders may not support the priorities although one of the purposes of this report is to gain support from Executive so that discussions can begin with stakeholders.
- 6.2 In addition, no transport modelling work has been undertaken to determine whether delivering these priority schemes will allow the amount of growth proposed in the Local Plan to be delivered.

## **7. Financial Implications**

- 7.1 It is considered that approval of this report will not have financial implications as the costs of producing this report and liaison with stakeholders will be met by the existing budget. However, with the exception of the M25/A3 J10 and Ash Road Bridge schemes each project will have significant financial implications for the Council, as there is no capital budget for any of the projects and the Council will need to apply for external funding to deliver them.
- 7.2 In addition, there is currently no revenue budget to undertake the feasibility work on the remaining SMC phases, Burnt Common slip roads and Guildford East (Marrow) station.
- 7.3 If the Council wishes to pursue and fund the delivery of these schemes then a project mandate and outline business case will be required for each scheme which will act as the 'bid' to the Council to be considered for funding as part of the Council's budget setting process for 2022-23. Given the current financial situation of the Council and the fact officers are currently projecting a medium term budget gap of £6million any revenue bid for feasibility funding will require additional savings to be made under the Council's savings strategy to fund the project feasibility work.

## **8. Legal Implications**

- 8.1 As there is currently no budget allocated to this, Full Council decision may be required if budget is to be allocated to the matter prior to the next Budget Council meeting.
- 8.2 Contracts for the feasibility study work will need to be procured in line with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Council's Procurement Procedure Rules. Contracts should be put in place to deliver the studies.

8.3 Section 106 payments must be spent in accordance with the terms of the relevant Section 106 agreement. A full business case should be developed for each scheme prior to applying for external funding. If external funding is granted it must be spent in accordance with the relevant funding agreement

8.4 Surrey County Council and Highways England are the relevant highways authorities and their support is fundamental to bringing forward the highway infrastructure schemes. Network Rail and any third party landowners affected by the schemes should be engaged early. Title reviews will be required at an early stage so ownership issues and title restrictions are factored into the scheme.

## **9. Human Resource Implications**

9.1 No HR implications apply.

## **10. Equality and Diversity Implications**

10.1 This duty has been considered in the context of this report and it has been concluded that there are no equality and diversity implications arising directly from this report.

## **11. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications**

11.1 The support for these improvements should assist with reducing carbon emissions, energy use and improving air quality although Environmental Impact Assessments may be required on a project by project basis to determine the specific impact.

## **12. Summary of Options**

12.1 The options available to the Executive are considered to be as follows:

1. Support the five priorities;
2. Not support the five priorities;
3. Wait until further transport modelling has been undertaken to demonstrate with a higher degree of evidence and therefore confidence what the key priorities are.

12.2 Supporting the five priorities now will enable officers to engage with stakeholders to gain their support and will enable discussions to commence regarding how potential funding of these schemes can be achieved. Support for these schemes will also assist with future transport modelling of them as there is a risk that the highway authorities (Surrey County Council and Highways England) will not support modelling highway and transport schemes that do not have stakeholder support and an outline funding plan.

## **13. Conclusion**

13.1 Corporate Programmes Team has highlighted five highway and transport schemes that are likely to be critical priorities to the Local Plan maintaining its housing trajectory and continuing to be up to date. They have been named 'priority schemes' and are in no particular order in this report.

- 13.2 As the A3 through Guildford scheme no longer forms part of the Government's Road Strategy Local Plan Policy ID2(2) requires the Council to review its transport evidence base to investigate the consequent cumulative impacts of approved developments and Local Plan growth including site allocations on the safe operation and the performance of the Local Road Networks and the Strategic Road Network.
- 13.3 The highway and transport Schemes that are likely to be critical to the Local Plan (in no particular order) are as follows:
- SRN2 – M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange 'Road Investment Strategy' scheme
  - NR2 and NR3 New rail stations at Guildford West (Park Barn) and Guildford East (Merrow)
  - SMC 1-6 - Sustainable Movement Corridor
  - SRN7 and SRN8 - A3 northbound on and off slip roads at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common)
  - LRN19 – New road bridge and footbridge scheme to enable level crossing closure on A323 Guildford Road adjacent to Ash railway station
- 13.4 The report sets out a commentary as to why we consider these schemes to be important. We have also highlighted some of the difficulties that the schemes may create in terms of wider issues that would need resolving as part of their future delivery. Some of the schemes have funding from various sources whilst other schemes have no funding.
- 13.5 We have had a meeting with Surrey County Council to discuss the priorities which they were very receptive to and supportive of and they are looking to align them with their own priorities moving forward.
- 13.6 The Executive is asked to approve the highway and transport infrastructure schemes set out in this report that are considered to be priorities and therefore critical to Local Plan delivery as currently envisaged. Should the Local Plan be reviewed or amended, the list of schemes may also require amendment accordingly.

#### **14. Background Papers**

None.

#### **15. Appendices**

Appendix 1: Extract from the Local Plan Infrastructure Schedule highlighting highway and transport schemes.



**Extract from the Local Plan Infrastructure Schedule highlighting highway and transport schemes**

Infrastructure Type Infrastructure Project	Delivered when	Delivered by	Likely cost (where known) and funding source	
<b>1</b>	<b>Transport</b>			
<b>NR</b>	<b>Rail</b>			
NR1	Guildford rail station capacity and interchange improvements	Between 2024 and post plan period	Network Rail	£100m Network Rail and developer funded
NR2	New rail station at Guildford West (Park Barn)	Between 2022 and 2029, with earliest opening from 2024	Network Rail, Surrey County Council, Royal Surrey County Hospital, Guildford Borough Council and developer(s)	£10m Developer funded
NR3	New rail station at Guildford East (Merrow) (to principally serve Gosden Hill Farm site)	Between 2024 and 2029	Network Rail, Surrey County Council and developer	£10m Developer funded
NR4	Electrification of North Downs Line, facilitating increased service frequency	Between 2019 and 2029	Network Rail	£30m Network Rail
NR5	Portsmouth Direct Line improvements (together with South West Main Line Peak Demand improvements), facilitating increased service frequency	Between 2029 and post plan period	Network Rail	£5m Network Rail
NR6	North Downs Line (Great Western Railway) service frequency and timetable improvements	2018	Network Rail and Great Western Railway	Budgeted for in Great Western Railway franchise

Infrastructure Type Infrastructure Project	Delivered when	Delivered by	Likely cost (where known) and funding source	
<b>SRN</b>	<b>Strategic Road Network</b>			
SRN1	A3 Guildford (A320 Stoke interchange junction to A31 Hog's Back junction) 'Road Investment Strategy' scheme (E31)	Between 2024 and 2027	Highways England	£100-250m Highways England and developer funded
SRN2	M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange 'Road Investment Strategy' scheme (E16)	Between 2020 and 2023	Highways England	£100-250m Highways England and developer funded
SRN3	Improved A3/A3100 Burpham junction with relocated A3 southbound off-slip and new A3 southbound on-slip (to principally serve Gosden Hill Farm site)	Between 2021 and 2023	Highways England and/or developer	£10m Developer funded
SRN4	M25 Junctions 10-16 'Road Investment Strategy' scheme (E15)	Between 2020 and 2023	Highways England	£100-250m Highways England
SRN5	A3 northbound off-slip lane widening at University Interchange (approaching Tesco roundabout) improvement scheme	Between 2019 and 2020	Highways England	Committed funding: Department for Transport £1.6m
SRN6	A3 southbound off-slip lane widening to A320 Stoke Interchange improvement scheme	Between 2019 and 2020	Highways England	Committed funding: Department for Transport £2.5m
SRN7	A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common)	Between 2021 and 2027	Highways England and/or developer	£10m Developer funded
SRN8	A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road (Burnt Common)	Between 2021 and 2027	Highways England and/or developer	£10m Developer funded

Agenda item number: 6  
Appendix 1

Infrastructure Type Infrastructure Project	Delivered when	Delivered by	Likely cost (where known) and funding source	
<b>LRN</b>	<b>Local Road Network</b>			
LRN1	<p>Guildford Town Centre Transport Package</p> <p>Component schemes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walnut Tree Close experimental closure scheme: experimental closure for up to 18 months to inform decision on a potential permanent closure</li> <li>Replacement Walnut Bridge scheme: a wider structure to cater for higher flows of pedestrians plus usage by cyclists</li> <li>Guildford College Link + scheme: a new pedestrian and cycle route linking Walnut Bridge (scheme 2) to Guildford College</li> <li>Millbrook car park junction improvement scheme: to remove requirement for exiting vehicles to circuit the Guildford gyratory</li> <li>A25 cycle corridor scheme: widening sections of this existing corridor to create a shared use path for pedestrians and cyclists up to 3m in width</li> <li>A25/A320 Stoke cross roads improvement scheme: improved provision for pedestrians and cyclists, bus priority, and reduced number of pedestrian and cyclist casualties</li> <li>A3100 London Road to Boxgrove roundabout corridor improvement scheme: bus stop facilities including RTP1 and creating an off-road shared use path for pedestrians and cyclists up to 3m in width</li> </ul>	2016/17–2019/20, which encompasses the delivery of the various component schemes	Surrey County Council for highway schemes, Guildford Borough Council for replacement Walnut Bridge	<p>£9.260m</p> <p>Committed funding package:</p> <p>Local Growth Fund £6.55m Guildford Borough Council £1.403m Developer funded £0.314m Surrey County Council £0.993m</p>
LRN2	A3/Egerton Road Tesco Roundabout improvement scheme	Between 2020 and 2026	Surrey County Council and/or Highways England	<p>£5m</p> <p>Highways England and developer funded</p>

Infrastructure Type Infrastructure Project	Delivered when	Delivered by	Likely cost (where known) and funding source	
LRN3	New signalised junction from Blackwell Farm site to A31 Farnham Road (to principally serve Blackwell Farm site)	Between 2021 and 2027	Developer	<p>£5m</p> <p>Developer funded</p>
LRN4	Access road at Blackwell Farm site with through link to Egerton Road (to principally serve Blackwell Farm site)	Between 2021 and 2027	Developer	<p>£20m</p> <p>Developer funded</p>
LRN5	Interventions to address potential highway performance issues resulting from development at Blackwell Farm site	Between 2021 and 2033	Highways England and/or developer	<p>£5-10m</p> <p>Developer funded</p>
LRN6	Interventions to address potential highway performance issues resulting from development at Gosden Hill Farm site	Between 2021 and 2033	Highways England and/or developer	<p>£5-10m</p> <p>Developer funded</p>
LRN7	Interventions to address potential highway performance issues resulting from development at Land at former Wisley airfield site. To include mitigation schemes to address issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>on the A3 and M25 and at the M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley interchange</li> <li>on B2215 Ripley High Street</li> <li>at the junctions of Ripley High Street with Newark Lane/Rose Lane</li> <li>at junction of Old Lane with A3 on-slip (Guildford bound)</li> <li>at junctions of Old Lane, Forest Road and Howard Road</li> </ul>	Between 2021 and 2033	Highways England and/or developer	<p>£25m</p> <p>Developer funded</p>
LRN8	Interventions to address potential highway performance issues, including on A320 Woking Road, resulting from development at SARP site	Between 2023 and 2033	Highways England and/or developer	<p>£5-10m</p> <p>Developer funded</p>
LRN9	A323 Ash Road, Ash Street and Guildford Road (Ash) traffic management and environmental improvement scheme	Between 2018 and 2026	Surrey County Council	<p>£1m</p> <p>Developer funded</p>
LRN10	B3411 Ash Hill Road (Ash) traffic management and environmental improvement scheme	Between 2018 and 2026	Surrey County Council	<p>£0.5m</p> <p>Developer funded</p>

	<b>Infrastructure Type Infrastructure Project</b>	<b>Delivered when</b>	<b>Delivered by</b>	<b>Likely cost (where known) and funding source</b>
LRN11	B3411 Ash Hill Road/A323 Guildford Road (Ash) junction improvement scheme	Between 2017 and 2026	Surrey County Council	£0.5m Developer funded
LRN12	B3411 Ash Vale Road (Ash Vale) environmental improvement scheme	Between 2018 and 2026	Surrey County Council	£0.8m Developer funded
LRN13	A323 Aldershot Road/A331 Blackwater Valley Route (Ash) junction improvement scheme	Between 2018 and 2026	Surrey County Council	£2m Developer funded and Local Growth Fund
LRN14	A331 Blackwater Valley Route with A31 Hog's Back (Tongham) junction improvement scheme	Between 2018 and 2026	Surrey County Council	£0.5m Developer funded and Local Growth Fund
LRN15	The Street (Tongham) environmental improvement scheme	Between 2018 and 2026	Surrey County Council	£0.5m Developer funded
LRN16	A31 Hog's Back (Tongham to Puttenham) road safety scheme	Between 2018 and 2026	Surrey County Council	£2.5m Developer funded
LRN17	B3000 Puttenham Hill/A31 Hog's Back junction (Puttenham) improvement scheme	Between 2021 and 2026	Surrey County Council	£1m Developer funded
LRN18	A247 Send Road/Send Barns Lane (Send) traffic management and environmental improvement scheme	Between 2018 and 2026	Surrey County Council	£1.5m Developer funded
LRN19	New road bridge and footbridge scheme to enable level crossing closure on A323 Guildford Road adjacent to Ash railway station	Between 2019 and 2024	Surrey County Council	£15m Developer funded and Network Rail
LRN20	East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme	Between 2019 and 2023	Surrey County Council	£1m Developer funded
LRN21	A322 Onslow Street, Laundry Road, A322 Woodbridge Road and A246 York Road junctions improvement scheme involving new and modified signalised junctions	Between 2020 and 2025	Surrey County Council	£10m Developer funded

	<b>Infrastructure Type Infrastructure Project</b>	<b>Delivered when</b>	<b>Delivered by</b>	<b>Likely cost (where known) and funding source</b>
LRN22	A323 Guildford Road/A324 Pirbright Road junction improvement scheme	Between 2019 and 2025	Surrey County Council	£0.5m Developer funded
LRN23	A281 Horsham Road/A248 Kings Road/A248 Broadford Road junction improvement schemes	Between 2021 and 2023	Surrey County Council	£2.5-5m Developer funded
LRN24	A247 Clandon Road/The Street (West Clandon) traffic management and environmental improvement scheme	Between 2020 and 2025	Surrey County Council	£1m Developer funded
<b>P&amp;R</b>	<b>Park and Ride</b>			
P&R1	Gosden Hill Farm Park and Ride (to principally mitigate traffic impact of Gosden Hill Farm site)	Between 2021 and 2023	Developer	£7.5m Developer funded
<b>SMC</b>	<b>Sustainable Movement Corridor</b>			
SMC1	Sustainable Movement Corridor: West	Between 2019 and 2034	Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council and developer(s)	£20m Developer funded and Local Growth Fund
SMC2	Sustainable Movement Corridor: Yorkie's Bridge	Between 2019 and 2034	Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council, Network Rail and developer(s)	£10m Developer funded and Local Growth Fund
SMC3	Sustainable Movement Corridor: Town Centre Phase 1	Between 2019 and 2022	Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council	£5-10m Developer funded and Local Growth Fund

Agenda item number: 6  
Appendix 1

Infrastructure Type	Infrastructure Project	Delivered when	Delivered by	Likely cost (where known) and funding source
SMC4	Sustainable Movement Corridor: Town Centre Phase 2	Between 2019 and 2034	Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council, Network Rail and developer(s)	£5-10m Developer funded and Local Growth Fund
SMC5	Sustainable Movement Corridor: North	Between 2019 and 2034	Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council and developer(s)	£20m Developer funded and Local Growth Fund
SMC6	Sustainable Movement Corridor: East	Between 2019 and 2034	Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council and developer	£20m Developer funded and Local Growth Fund
<b>BT</b>	<b>Bus Transport</b>			
BT1	New Guildford town centre bus facilities	Between 2018 and 2022	Surrey County Council and/or Guildford Borough Council and/or developer(s)	£5-10m Developer funded
BT2	Bus interchange at Effingham Junction rail station (or alternatively Horsley rail station) (to principally serve Land at former Wisley airfield site)	Between 2021 and 2025	Developer	£0.25m Developer funded
BT3	Extended and/or new bus services to serve the Land at former Wisley airfield site and which will also serve Effingham Junction railway station and/or Horsley railway station, Guildford and Cobham to be provided and secured in perpetuity	Between 2021 and 2022	Developer	To be confirmed Developer funded

Infrastructure Type	Infrastructure Project	Delivered when	Delivered by	Likely cost (where known) and funding source
BT4	Extended and/or new bus services to serve the Gosden Hill Farm site and which will also serve the eastern suburbs of Guildford and the town centre to be provided	Between 2021 and 2022	Developer	To be confirmed Developer funded
BT5	Extended and/or new bus services to serve the Blackwell Farm site and which will also serve the western suburbs of Guildford and the town centre to be provided	Between 2021 and 2022	Developer	To be confirmed Developer funded
<b>AM</b>	<b>Active Modes</b>			
AM1	Guildford Wayfinding signage system – Phase 2	Between 2019 and 2034	Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council and developers	£0.22m Developer funded, Local Growth Fund and Surrey County Council
AM2	Comprehensive Guildford borough cycle network, excluding AM3	Between 2019 and post plan period, which encompasses the delivery of various component schemes	Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council and developers	£20m Developer funded, Local Growth Fund and Surrey County Council
AM3	Off site cycle network from the Land at former Wisley airfield site to key destinations including Effingham Junction railway station, Horsley railway station/Station Parade, Ripley and Byfleet, with improvements to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist	Between 2021 and 2025	Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council and developers	£6.5m Developer funded

Executive Report

Wards affected: n/a

Report of the Director of Strategic Services

Author: John Armstrong (Democratic Services and Elections Manager)

Tel: 01483 444102

Email: john.armstrong@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Joss Bigmore

Tel: 07974 979369

Email: joss.bigmore@guildford.gov.uk

Date: 20 July 2021

## **Annual Governance Statement 2020-21**

### **Executive Summary**

The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 require the Council to prepare an Annual Governance Statement (AGS) detailing the governance framework and procedures that have operated at the Council during the year, a review of their effectiveness, significant governance issues that have occurred and a statement of assurance. This report outlines the background to the AGS; and sets out in Appendix 1, the AGS for 2020-21. The AGS is underpinned by the Annual Opinion Report (April 2020 to March 2021) prepared by KPMG, who are the Council's internal audit managers, which was considered by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee at its meeting held on 25 March 2021.

The draft AGS will be included in the Council's statement of accounts for 2020-21. The AGS acknowledges the significant challenges (both financial and organisational) placed on the Council due to the Covid 19 pandemic, which came at a time when the Council was undergoing a major organisational transformation (Future Guildford), and the need to return to the good governance practices and processes that the Council normally prides itself upon. The significant governance issues identified during the year, are reported in Appendix 1 section 6.

Where we have identified areas for further improvement, we will take the necessary action to implement changes that will further develop our governance framework.

This report will also be considered by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee at its meeting on 29 July 2021, and any comments from the Executive will be reported to that meeting.

The Corporate Governance and Standards Committee has authority to approve the AGS.

**Recommendation to Executive:**

The Executive is asked to consider the Council's Annual Governance Statement for 2020-21 as set out in Appendix 1 to this report, and to forward any comments to the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee for consideration at its meeting on 29 July 2021.

Reason for Recommendation:

To comply with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015, the Council must prepare, approve, and publish an Annual Governance Statement.

**Is the report (or part of it) exempt from publication? No**

**1. Purpose of Report**

1.1 This report explains the requirement for the Council to prepare an Annual Governance Statement (AGS), which the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee will be asked to approve on 29 July, and the Leader and Managing Director to sign on behalf of the Council.

**2. Strategic Framework**

2.1 Ensuring long-term financial stability and sound financial governance is a key priority under the 'Your Council' theme within the Corporate Plan.

**3. Background**

3.1 The Council has a responsibility to ensure that it conducts its business in accordance with the law and proper standards, that public money is safeguarded, properly accounted for, and used economically, efficiently and effectively.

3.2 In discharging these overall obligations, the Council is responsible for putting in place appropriate arrangements for the governance of its affairs and ensuring that there is a sound system of internal control that facilitates the effective exercise of its functions and includes arrangements for the management of risk. The overall system of controls across the Council contributes to the effective corporate governance of the organisation.

3.3 The Democratic Services and Elections Manager has drafted the statement in consultation with the Head of Paid Service, the Chief Finance Officer, the Monitoring Officer, and Neil Hewitson of KPMG (as the Council's internal audit manager).

3.4 Good governance is about getting things right first time by focusing on the things that matter most. It is about:

- demonstrating leadership and respect for the democratic process and the purpose of public bodies making proper, timely, and transparent decisions
- managing risk and allocating resources effectively
- knowing your customers and stakeholders

- being open, honest, and taking responsibility and accountability for your decisions
- demonstrating high standards of integrity and behaviour both as an individual and as a corporate body.

- 3.5 Good governance is the responsibility of everyone within the organisation and impacts on all the activities of the Council and how we deliver our services.
- 3.6 The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA)/Society of Local Authority Chief Executives (SOLACE) have defined a common governance framework and a set of principles for all public services, called *Delivering Good Governance in Local Government*. During 2016, they issued an update to the framework. The AGS attached at **Appendix 1** follows the 2016 updated framework and the key principles of good governance provided therein.
- 3.7 As part of the AGS, we have identified a number of significant governance issues that the Council is working on resolving. These are outlined in section 6 of Appendix 1.

#### **4. Financial Implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial implications related to this report

#### **5. Legal Implications**

- 5.1 In order to comply with Regulation 6 (1) (b) of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015, the Council must prepare an AGS in respect of each financial year. A committee of the Council, or the Council itself, may approve the AGS.
- 5.2 At its extraordinary meeting on 6 July 2021, the Council agreed to amend the terms of reference of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee to include the consideration and approval of the AGS in advance of the formal approval of the Council's Statement of Accounts.
- 5.3 Regulation 10 of the 2015 Regulations requires the Council to publish the AGS alongside the adopted statement of accounts each year.
- 5.4 The government introduced changes to the 2015 Regulations as a consequence of the pandemic to extend the statutory audit deadline for 2020-21 and 2021-22 for all local authorities. The publication date for audited accounts will move from 31 July to 30 September 2021 for all local authority bodies.

#### **6. Human Resource Implications**

- 6.1 There are no human resource implications to this report.
- 6.2 We will work with the Communications team on any communications issues that arise.

**7. Conclusion**

- 7.1 During 2020-21, the Council faced unprecedented challenges from COVID, with significant and varied operational pressures. In addition, the Future Guildford programme of transformation and re-organisation remains ongoing and as part of this the Council has further system implementations. Against this challenging backdrop of the pandemic alongside organisational transformation, during 2020-21 the Council received seven 'partial assurance with improvements required' reports, including in the areas of core financial control, risk management and data quality.
- 7.2 With the pandemic restrictions coming to an end and the organisational transformation and new systems being embedded, the Council will strive to make significant improvements in its governance framework moving forward.

**8. Background Papers**

Delivering Good Governance in Local Government (2016) (CIPFA/SOLACE)

**9. Appendices**

Appendix 1: Annual Governance Statement 2020-21



## Annual Governance Statement 2020-21

### 1. SCOPE OF RESPONSIBILITY

- 1.1. Guildford Borough Council is responsible for ensuring that it conducts its business in accordance with the law and proper standards and that public money is safeguarded, properly accounted for and used economically, efficiently and effectively. The Council also has a duty under the Local Government Act 1999 to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised, having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness.
- 1.2. In discharging this overall responsibility, the Council is responsible for putting in place proper arrangements for the governance of its affairs to facilitate the effective exercise of its functions, including arrangements for the management of risk.
- 1.3. The Council has considered the principles of the CIPFA/SOLACE framework *Delivering Good Governance in Local Government* (2016), including compliance with the CIPFA publication on *The Role of the Chief Financial Officer in Local Government* (2016) in the preparation of this statement.
- 1.4. This statement explains how the Council has complied with the code and meets the requirements of regulation 4 of the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 in relation to internal control.

### 2. THE PURPOSE OF THE GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

- 2.1 The governance framework comprises the systems, processes, culture, and values by which the authority is directed and controlled and the activities through which it accounts to, engages with, and leads the community. It enables the authority to monitor the achievement of its strategic objectives and to consider whether those objectives have led to the delivery of appropriate, cost effective services.
- 2.2 The system of internal control is a significant part of that framework and is designed to manage risk to a reasonable level. It cannot eliminate all risk of failure to achieve policies, aims and objectives and can therefore only provide reasonable and not absolute assurance of effectiveness. The system of internal control is based on an ongoing process designed to identify and prioritise the risks to the achievement of the Council's policies, aims and objectives, to evaluate the likelihood and impact should those risks be realised and to manage those risks efficiently, effectively and economically.
- 2.3 The governance framework has been in place for the year ended 31 March 2021 and up to the date of approval of the statement of accounts.

### 3. GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

- 3.1 The Council is a complex organisation with an appropriately comprehensive governance framework that works in a dynamic environment and keeps its processes under constant review. A description of how the Council puts the principles of good governance, set out in the CIPFA/SOLACE framework into practice is set out in the following table along with recent achievements, developments, and areas for improvement.

**Principles of Good Governance**

**Arrangements the Council has for delivering good governance**

**Recent achievements, developments and areas for improvement**

A. Behaving with integrity, demonstrating strong commitment to ethical values, and respecting the rule of law

- Council’s Constitution, includes:
  - Council procedure rules for conduct at meetings
  - financial and procurement procedure rules
  - codes of conduct for Officers (reviewed in 2019) and Councillors
  - protocol on decision making by lead councillors
  - Protocol on Councillor/Officer Relations
  - arrangements for dealing with allegations of misconduct by councillors
- Probity in planning local code of practice (reviewed in 2019)
- Induction for new councillors and staff on standards of behaviour expected
- Staff performance framework includes behavioural framework & behaviour profiles are included within job descriptions
- Regular staff performance review in place
- Declarations of interest made and recorded at meetings
- Register of councillors’ interests maintained
- Register of gifts and hospitality maintained for Councillors and staff
- Anti-Fraud and Corruption Strategy
- Anti-Bribery Policy
- Whistle blowing policy

*The Corporate Governance Task Group has reviewed and made recommendations to relevant decision-making bodies on the following matters:*

- (a) *the Councillors’ Code of Conduct, including the policy on acceptance of gifts and hospitality (Council on 6 October 2020 and 19 May 2021)*
- (b) *the 15 best practice recommendations of the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CGSC<sup>1</sup> on 30 July 2020/Executive on 22 September 2020/ Council on 6 October 2020)*
- (c) *guidance on the use of social media by councillors (Executive on 22 September 2020)*
- (d) *the Protocol on Councillor/ Officer Relations (Council on 6 October 2020)*
- (e) *the draft Council Size Submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England*

---

<sup>1</sup> Corporate Governance and Standards Committee

## Principles of Good Governance

### Arrangements the Council has for delivering good governance

- Officer corporate governance group to monitor compliance with laws and council policies
- Officer health and safety group in place to monitor health and safety compliance
- Complaints policy in place
- Customer services manager monitors and reports on complaints performance to corporate management team and CGSC as part of the Corporate Performance Monitoring report
- Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (CGSC) in place whose remit is set out within the Constitution
- Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) review of decision making
- Procurement strategy, policy and toolkit in place (updated in 2018)
- An officer Corporate Procurement Board (CPB) monitors compliance with the procurement strategy and policy
- All committee reports to Executive and Council require review of legal and financial implications to be completed and signed off by Monitoring Officer (MO) and Chief Finance Officer (CFO)
- Executive advisory boards in place to advise Executive on matters of strategic importance to the Council
- Monitoring Officer provisions in place

### Recent *achievements, developments and areas for improvement*

*(Council on 17 December 2020)*

- (f) approved draft Email Signature Guidance for councillors referred to the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee for approval.*

The Task Group is currently working on, or has yet to review the following areas:

- the effectiveness of internal communications between officers and councillors
- proposals to promote transparency, and effective communications and reporting, including the Council's Communications Protocol.
- review of anomalies in the Constitution

*Corporate Procurement Board has met fortnightly throughout 2020-21 to improve governance arrangements around procurement, particularly where exemptions have been applied. A new procurement strategy was agreed by the Executive in June 2020 and revised and updated Procurement Procedure Rules*

**Principles of Good Governance**

**Arrangements the Council has for delivering good governance**

**Recent achievements, developments and areas for improvement**

B. Ensuring openness and comprehensive stakeholder engagement

- The Council's vision and priorities are set out in the corporate plan
- Consultation policy and community engagement strategy in place which adheres to consultation standards
- Freedom of Information Act performance monitored by corporate management team and CGSC. Log of FOI responses is published on the website
- Online council tax information published
- Transparency information published on website
- Records of decision making maintained and published on website
- Forward programme of committee meeting dates and agenda items published on-line with reporting dates adhered to
- Citizens' panel in place and regularly consulted with
- Active programme of focus groups and surveys undertaken for specific service initiatives
- Active use of social media and on-line tools to engage customers
- Regular council newsletter About Guildford issued electronically on a quarterly basis
- Consultation responses published on the Council's website (e.g. Local Plan)
- Recognition of the importance of and active engagement in key strategic partnerships such as Guildford Surrey Board, Health and Wellbeing Board, Local Enterprise Partnership (EM3) and service specific partnerships

*were adopted by the Council in May 2021.*

*In 2020 we undertook a public consultation on the Council's priorities for services and spending as part of the budget process. This was used to inform the savings strategy. The corporate plan is currently being updated.*

Principles of Good Governance	Arrangements the Council has for delivering good governance	Recent <i>achievements, developments and areas for improvement</i>
C. Defining outcomes in terms of sustainable economic, social, and environmental benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corporate Plan 2018-2023 which sets out the Council’s vision, key themes and priorities</li> <li>• Performance Monitoring Reports against corporate plan priorities reported to Corporate Management Team and CGSC</li> <li>• New Programme and project management system in place, and undergoing development</li> <li>• Community engagement strategy</li> <li>• Corporate risk register in place</li> <li>• Financial risk register in place and used to inform the financial sustainability of the budget and adequacy of the level of reserves</li> <li>• Monitoring of key performance indicators undertaken by corporate management team</li> <li>• Committee report template now includes Climate Change/Sustainability Implications</li> <li>• Business planning process and capital programme development aligned to the corporate plan through the new service planning and project and programme governance framework, bids for funding scored against achievement of corporate plan priorities</li> <li>• Future Guildford Transformation Programme in place, overseen by the Future Guildford Board and regularly reported to Overview and Scrutiny Committee</li> </ul>	<p>Internal Audit of Risk management in 2020-21 found partial assurance and action plan for improvement is in place. The risk management framework, strategy and policy need significant update.</p> <p>Internal Audit of performance monitoring also provided with partial assurance. The new framework introduced in 2020-21 needs to be embedded.</p> <p><i>Future Guildford Phase B finally completed and transition to the new structure took place within 2020-21.</i></p>
D. Determining the interventions necessary to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium term financial strategy and plan in place, reviewed annually and published as part of the Council’s budget book</li> <li>• Business planning process in place to align financial resources with</li> </ul>	

**Principles of Good Governance**

optimise the achievement of the intended outcomes

**Arrangements the Council has for delivering good governance**

- corporate plan priorities
- New mandate and business case process introduced for new projects and policies
- Business planning guidance for managers in place and reviewed annually
- Scrutiny of the budget and business planning bids by Joint Executive Advisory Board and Councillor task group
- Forward Plan maintained on a rolling 12 month basis
- Regular corporate management team and Executive liaison meetings held to discuss strategy
- Directors and senior officers hold regular 1:1 meetings with Lead Councillors
- Corporate management team hold regular directorate level feedback sessions
- Service Leaders' group in place
- Transformation Board in place which monitors the transformation programme
- Major Projects Board in place to monitor the delivery of major projects
- Property Review Group in place to review all assets on a rolling programme and optimise property asset utilisation and performance
- Capital Programme Monitoring Group in place to monitor progress of capital projects, which are not major projects
- Consequences of COVID Pandemic and the Council's response reported to Executive and Council in May 2020 and then monitored by Overview and Scrutiny Committee throughout the year.

**Recent achievements, developments and areas for improvement**

*Due to the COVID pandemic the Major Projects Portfolio Board did not meet in 2020-21*

## Principles of Good Governance

## Arrangements the Council has for delivering good governance

## Recent *achievements, developments and areas for improvement*

E. Developing capacity, including the capability of leadership and the individuals within it

- Organisational development framework includes continuous performance and development reviews of staff through one to one meetings and clear job role profiles with behavioural profiles.
- The constitution sets out the role of statutory officers and the role of the Leader
- The Council is compliant with CIPFA guidance on the Role of the Chief Finance Officer (CFO)
- Head of Paid Service (HoPS), CFO, and MO are part of the corporate management team and always attend Executive-Management Team Liaison Group and full Executive meetings
- Professionally trained staff in relevant fields in place and continuing professional development encouraged as part of performance and development framework
- Regular staff development training programme in place
- Active support for staff to obtain external qualifications
- Scheme of delegation and financial procedure rules in place
- Councillor development steering group in place which develops and implements an active programme of Councillor training
- Achievement of the South East Charter accreditation for Elected Member Development (January 2020)
- Recognition of the importance of and active engagement in key strategic partnerships such as Guildford Surrey Board, Health and Wellbeing Board Local Enterprise Partnership (EM3) and service specific partnerships

*Financial Procedure Rules need to be reviewed in 2021-22*  
*Engagement with Key strategic partnership boards temporarily suspended during 2020-21 and the COVID pandemic. However, the Council has worked with partners through the multi-agency Local Resilience Forum and its Strategic Co-ordinating Group as required through the Surrey*

**Principles of Good Governance**

**Arrangements the Council has for delivering good governance**

**Recent *achievements, developments and areas for improvement***

*Emergency Plan*

F. Managing Risks and performance through robust internal control and strong public financial management

- Work with partners through the Local Resilience Forum
- Internal audit work programme informed by risks
- Internal audit is outsourced, fully resourced and effective
- Compliance the CIPFA code on managing the risk of fraud and corruption
- Role of the overview and scrutiny committee is clearly set out in the constitution and its work programme is developed by the chairman, vice-chairman, and officers and agreed by the committee. Agendas and minutes are published online.
- Regular MO and CFO meetings in place to address statutory responsibilities
- Officer corporate governance group oversees key governance, data protection and risk management information and receives reports from the health and safety group
- Role of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (CGSC) is clearly set out in the constitution and has an active work programme informed by the officer corporate governance group and agreed by the committee. Agendas and minutes are published online.
- A summary of internal and external audit reports is reported to CGSC on a regular basis along with annual Head of Internal audit opinion
- Progress against audit plan and individual audit recommendations are monitored and reported to CGSC
- Council has comprehensive data protection policies and a designated data protection officer who monitors compliance with legislation
- Information security risk group, led by the Senior Information Risk Owner

Risk management framework needs significant update as found by internal audit. Risk management at service and project level needs review and embedding and corporate risk register needs to be updated and regularly reported to CMT/CGSC.



## Principles of Good Governance

### Arrangements the Council has for delivering good governance

### Recent *achievements, developments and areas for improvement*

#### G. Implementing good practices in transparency, reporting and audit to deliver effective accountability

- in place which reviews the Council's information governance procedures and any necessary improvements
- CGSC receives regular financial monitoring reports
  - All projects require a risk register and project board
  - The Council publishes significant information on its website
  - 'Style guide' in place to encourage officers to write reports in plain English
  - Annual financial statements include a narrative summary on the Council's performance during the year as well as reporting the financial position
  - Effective internal audit function in place which complies with public sector audit standards and the CIPFA statement on the Role of the Head of Internal Audit
  - Community engagement strategy in place
  - Council has reaffirmed, and adopted as best practice, the position that all committee reports are made public unless there are unequivocal legal or commercial reasons to the contrary and that where practicable, information within a report which is legally exempt from publication should be isolated from the body of the report as a restricted appendix, with the remainder of the report made available to the public.
  - All restricted committee reports now clearly and precisely state at the point the agenda is published all of the following:
    - (a) why the content is to be treated as exempt from the access to information publication rules.

*The Council does not currently produce a formal annual report; however, the CFO's Narrative Statement in the Council's Statement of Accounts reports the majority of information that an annual report would be expected to cover.*

*The Council is compliant with the mandatory elements of the Local Government Transparency Code 2015 in respect of the publication of data.*

*The Corporate Governance Task Group, referred to above, will also be examining proposals to promote transparency and effective communications*

**Principles of Good Governance**

**Arrangements the Council has for delivering good governance**

**Recent *achievements, developments and areas for improvement***

- (b) to whom within the Council the content is restricted
  - (c) when, following a period of exemption, the exempt information can be expected to be made public.
  - (d) details of how the decision to maintain the exemption may be challenged.
- Working group reports and minutes made available to all councillors.

#### 4. REVIEW OF EFFECTIVENESS

- 4.1. The Council has responsibility for conducting, at least annually, a review of the effectiveness of its governance framework, including the system of internal control. The review of effectiveness is informed by the work of the senior managers within the authority who have responsibility for the development and maintenance of the governance environment, the Head of Internal Audit's annual report, and by comments made by the external auditors and other review agencies and inspectorates.
- 4.2. The Head of Internal Audit (HoIA) is required to provide an annual opinion in accordance with Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS), based upon and limited to the work performed on the overall adequacy and effectiveness of the Council's risk management, control and governance processes (i.e. the system of internal control). This is achieved through a risk-based programme of work, agreed with Management and approved by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, which can provide assurance, subject to the inherent limitations.
- 4.3. The purpose of the HoIA Opinion is to contribute to the assurances available to the Accountable Officer<sup>2</sup> and the Council which underpin the Council's own assessment of the effectiveness of the system of internal control. The opinion does not imply that the HoIA has covered all risks and assurances relating to the Council. The opinion is derived from the conduct of risk-based plans generated from a robust and Management-led Assurance Framework. As such it is one component that the Council takes into account in writing this Annual Governance Statement.
- 4.4. The HoIA Opinion for 2020-21 is one of: '**Partial assurance with improvements required**'. Whilst internal audit have noted robust aspects of the Council's system of internal control, for example the 'significant assurance with minor improvement opportunities' achieved in 2020-21 in respect of the payroll control environment, there are multiple areas that received 'partial assurance with improvements required' and will require prioritised attention in 2021-22, for example, implementing and embedding the new risk management framework and the performance monitoring framework.

#### 5. INTERNAL AUDIT STATEMENT

- 5.1 The HoIA Opinion was presented to the Council's Corporate Governance and Standards Committee on 25 March 2021 ([see HoIA Opinion](#)<sup>3</sup>). In 2020-21, there were 11 planned pieces of work. Over the year, 9 reviews were completed, and two reviews were deferred to the 2021-22 audit plan. The results of the work carried out in the year to 31 March 2021 are shown in the table below:

Assurance Rating	Number of Audits	
Significant Assurance	0	0%
Significant Assurance with minor improvement opportunities	1	11%
Partial assurance with improvements required	7	78%
No Assurance	0	0%
No Opinion (one-off projects) Value for Money	1	11%
In progress (Inc. fundamental service reviews)	0	0%

<sup>2</sup> The Chief Finance Officer

<sup>3</sup> The Opinion forms part of Appendix 1 of Agenda Item 7

5.2 Internal audit reports provide management recommendations designed to address weaknesses in the system of internal control. The outcomes of these audits are reported on a summary basis to the CGSC every quarter giving councillors an opportunity to understand the Council's compliance with key controls and to discuss any areas of concern with the auditors. We also update councillors on the progress with implementation of recommendations. In 2020-21, Internal Audit raised 6 high priority recommendations as follows:

- 2 high priority recommendations relate to our local risk management review: these related to the introduction of a consistent council-wide local risk management framework and the implementation and roll-out of the newly designed risk management processes and procedures that were in progress at the time of the audit review
- 2 high priority recommendations relate to performance monitoring KPIs. These related to the implementation of the newly designed internal performance reporting framework and the staff sickness absence KPI.
- 2 high priority recommendations relate to the Income and Accounts Receivable and Expenditure and Accounts Payable reviews. These relate to the availability of evidence to support that controls have operated in line with design. Due to the implementation of Business World and the compounding difficulties that have arisen due to the Covid-19 pandemic. There has been difficulty accessing the required documentation to facilitate completion of the compliance testing and the reviews were therefore limited to reviewing the design of controls. These review areas will be revisited in the 2021-22 audit plan to complete compliance testing in these areas.

5.3 During 2020-21 the Council faced unprecedented challenges from COVID, with significant and varied operational pressures. In addition, the Future Guildford programme of transformation and re-organisation remains ongoing and, as part of this, the Council has further system implementations. Against this challenging backdrop of the pandemic alongside organisational transformation, during 2020-21 the Council received seven 'partial assurance with improvements required' reports, including in the areas of core financial control, risk management and data quality.

## **6. SIGNIFICANT GOVERNANCE ISSUES AND ACTION PLAN**

6.1. This year has been unprecedented; the Council has undertaken a period of transformational change whilst at the same time responding to the COVID 19 pandemic and continues to face on-going financial pressures. As a result of this challenging environment, it is recognised that there has been a reduction in the good governance arrangements the Council normally prides itself upon. Where we have identified areas for further improvement, we will take the necessary action to implement changes that will further develop our governance framework.

### **Progress on Governance Issues reported in the 2019-20 Annual Governance Statement:**

6.2. The significant governance issues arising in 2019-20 and progress made against them are shown in table below:

Area	Actions Agreed	Progress Made
Openness and Transparency	<p>To implement the Council motion from October 2019</p> <p>Set up a task group to implement concerns raised.</p>	<p>Task group has met a number of times and reported its findings. A summary of progress is set out in the table in paragraph 3.1 above</p>
Governance support for GBC Holdings Ltd and North Downs Housing Ltd	<p>Concerns over Finance and Legal involvement in the governance and financial arrangements of the two companies established by the Council. However, the external auditor had acknowledged that the core business processes operated satisfactorily. The Business Plan is currently out of date and is in the process of being reviewed and updated.</p>	<p>KPMG carried out an audit of the companies which was completed in 2020-21 and reported to the CGSC on 14 January 2021. The audit gave partial assurance with improvements required and an action to address identified improvements. There was one high priority improvement relating to terms of reference for the company boards and the Council's governance around performance reporting. The recommendations will be subject to Audit follow up review in 2021-22.</p>
Project Management	<p>The Major Projects Portfolio Board was working well and was raising corporate awareness of project management and providing a new overview of the process. However, not all projects had boards and were not operating as well as they could. There were concerns that several projects with considerable contingency funds were overspending and that information and cost reports were not being fed back to Finance. We need to ensure that there are consistent processes and measurable outcomes.</p>	<p>The Strategy and Communications team have recently implemented revised Programme and Project Governance Framework and are collating all projects across the Council for monitoring purposes.</p>
Procurement	<p>We are a complex authority and we recognise that the procurement processes need to be as efficient as possible. We control certain areas of spend very tightly but we need to achieve economies of scale by rationalising contracts and understanding more fully our category spend.</p>	<p>A new procurement strategy has been approved by Executive along with an updated set of procurement procedure rules during 2020-21. This includes a gateway approval process for high value contracts. The Corporate Procurement Board is overseeing procurement compliance across the Council.</p>

Area	Actions Agreed	Progress Made
ICT Asset Management	Following reports of a discrepancy in some of the Council's ICT equipment we carried out an audit review which found that there were inconsistent asset management controls which resulted in a loss of some equipment and, if not rectified, would have put the Council's assets at risk. However, the financial controls that were in place operated as intended and highlighted the issue.	Asset management of portable ICT equipment is carried out through the NetHelpDesk system in the Resources case team.

- 6.3 In addition, there were a number of follow-up reviews from 2019-20, which were revisited in 2020-21. The follow up audit revealed that of the recommendations made in the previous year, 9 had been fully implemented, 6 recommendations were partially implemented and 9 were not yet implemented. These will be subject to further follow up review during 2021-22.

**New Governance Issues arising in 2020-21:**

Impact of COVID-19 pandemic

- 6.4 Although the lockdown due to the coronavirus outbreak started in the last week of the 2019-20 financial year, the subsequent impact on the Council's services and governance arrangements has been considerable, occurring as it did at a time of organisational transformation, and ongoing financial uncertainties regarding the future funding of services and major projects. The impact has continued through 2020-21 as various easing and then tightening of restrictions have been made by government. It is anticipated that some impact will continue into 2021-22 and possibly the medium-term.
- 6.5 The Council has adhered, and responded at pace, to government guidance in response to the pandemic. Priorities were necessarily changed to focus on the need to support our most vulnerable residents, local businesses, and essential services. More recently the Council has been supporting the vaccination programme. Business as usual changed substantially to accommodate new expectations and services introduced by government and to work with our partners in the Local Resilience Forum, but key processes and functions have been maintained. The impact of the pandemic will inform the review of our key priorities in the Council's Corporate Plan, which commenced in 2019, and our medium-term financial plan.
- 6.6 The Council's response to the pandemic was discussed, at length, at various meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee during the year, at which the Managing Director outlined the ongoing impact of the crisis on local residents and businesses, and the help and support provided by the Council. The Committee was reminded of timelines and governance relating to COVID-19 and advised of the Council services that had been maintained and suspended in the crisis. In addition, the Managing Director informed the Committee of the new and extended services delivered by the Council during the emergency. The financial impact of the pandemic on the Council has been monitored through both the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee. A

new COVID monitoring report to monitor economic indicators associated with the response and recovery was introduced and regularly reported to Councillors via email.

- 6.7 The government introduced changes to the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 as a consequence of the pandemic to extend the statutory audit deadline for 2020-21 and 2021-22 for all local authorities. The publication date for audited accounts will move from 31 July to 30 September 2021 for all local authority bodies.
- 6.8 The government also made regulations under the Coronavirus Act 2020 to allow councils to conduct meetings and take decisions in ways other than face to face so that decisions can still be made to maintain good governance, and principles of openness and accountability. The Council initially adapted its approach by assessing which decisions could be delayed and re-scheduled and which decisions needed to be made to deal with the pandemic. Remote meetings were then instigated in April 2020 to ensure that transparency and good governance prevailed and also to allow access to the public and press. Remote meetings have continued to May 2021.
- 6.9 Demands on IT systems and staff will be considerable as most office-based staff continued to work remotely for significant periods of time. Procedures are in place to deal with a phased and safe return to work as lockdown restrictions are eased but to also transition the Council to a more agile working policy for the longer term.
- 6.10 The continued financial uncertainty regarding government funding of local government beyond 2020-21 has, to a large extent, been over-ridden by the financial challenges associated with funding the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, which creates a significant challenge in terms of budget setting and medium-term financial planning.
- 6.11 An ongoing assessment of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the Council's services and systems will be needed to ensure good governance.

#### Compliance with CIPFA Financial Management (FM) Code

- 6.12 2020-21 is a 'shadow year' for the implementation of the CIPFA FM Code. As such, an assessment of the extent to which the authority complies with the Code has been undertaken by the Director of Resources. The authority is confident that it is generally compliant with the Code but has identified some key areas where improvements could be made as follows:
  - (a) Further financial training and guidance for budget managers and staff across the authority is required
  - (b) A review of the performance of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee against the CIPFA Audit Committee Guidance would be beneficial
  - (c) The Council could benefit from a formal external financial resilience assessment
  - (d) Financial benchmarking reports should be reported to Councillors on an annual basis
  - (e) The Council should establish a long-term 10 to 20-year financial plan and vision, which should include scenario planning
  - (f) The Council's asset management framework, policy and guidance should be updated along with introducing a formal asset management plan.

#### Risk Management

- 6.13 During 2020-21, an internal audit review of risk management found partial assurance with improvements required. The audit recommended introduction of a consistent council-wide risk management framework. It found that there are no central processes or specific guidance mandating how risk should be managed at a local or project level. As a result, the auditors recommended updating the existing 'Risk management strategy and framework' on a more regular basis and communicating this to relevant staff so that there is a clear, consistent approach to risk management. The audit also recommended that a revised risk management framework be implemented; formally devising a plan that unifies the risk management documents, processes and required actions at a corporate and local risk level.

Performance Management and Monitoring

- 6.14 During 2020-21, an internal audit review of performance management found partial assurance with improvements required. The audit recommended implementation of the internal performance reporting framework through development of the new performance reporting framework – ensuring that there is a clear schedule of KPIs to be reported, including definitions of KPIs, roles and responsibilities for preparation and frequency of reporting. The audit also found a need to improve the collection and quality of data and systems used to calculate some performance indicators.

Core Financial Systems

- 6.15 During 2020-21, an internal audit review of core financial systems found partial assurance with improvements required. The audit raised two high priority recommendations related to the availability of evidence to support controls operating. Implementation of Business World coupled with COVID has impacted the availability of the required documentation. Financial records with relevant supporting evidence must be available to demonstrate that the Council has maintained a robust control environment at all times.
- 6.16 During 2020-21, the Council has carried out regular payroll reconciliations to ensure that net pay totals are correct and have been reconciled to the payment run summary sheets. However, regular reconciliations of payroll deductions posted into the General Ledger via the payroll control account were not undertaken. BusinessWorld is an integrated Enterprise Resource Planning system and entries into the general ledger via the payroll control account are automatic, so there had been an assumption that reconciliation may not be necessary. Issues recently identified in relation to payroll costing into the general ledger has identified a need to still complete a reconciliation between the general ledger and the Payroll Control Account.

**7. ASSURANCE SUMMARY**

- 7.1 Good governance is about running things properly. It is the means by which the Council shows it is taking decisions for the good of the people of our area in an equitable and open way. It recognises the standards of behaviour that support good decision-making: collective and individual integrity, openness and honesty. It is the foundation for the delivery of good quality services and fundamental to showing that public money is well spent.



- 7.2 During 2020-21, the Council faced unprecedented challenges from COVID, with significant and varied operational pressures. In addition, the Future Guildford programme of transformation and re-organisation remains ongoing and as part of this the Council has further system implementations. Against this challenging backdrop of the pandemic alongside organisational transformation, during 2020-21 the Council received seven 'partial assurance with improvements required' reports, including in the areas of core financial control, risk management and data quality.
- 7.3 We confirm, to the best of our knowledge and belief, that this Statement provides an accurate and fair view.

Signed:

Leader of the Council on behalf of Guildford Borough Council

Signed:

Managing Director on behalf of Guildford Borough Council

