



**STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS**

Tuesday, 21st September, 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 Angela Gunning, Ramsey Nagaty, George Potter, Deborah Seabrook and Paul Spooner were also in attendance.

**Agenda  
Item No.**

**Officer(s) to  
action Item**

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tim Anderson, Lead Councillor for Resources.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader observed that last weekend had seen the annual Heritage Open Days take place across the borough. Although final visitor numbers were yet to be confirmed the weather and variety of open venues had seen great success. The Leader thanked the Council's new Events Team, all of the volunteers and the venues themselves.

Car Free Day would take place in Guildford on Sunday 26 September. There would be a range of events, live music, stalls and activities going on in the town centre from 10am until 4:30pm to promote sustainable travel and tackling climate change.

Social media videos would be posted on the website setting out for residents what key areas the Council was working on in response to residents' feedback. The first video would look at the new Customer Service Centre. The Leader was pleased to note that over 10,000 Guildford households had signed up to the new 'MyGuildford' accounts that provided a personalised approach to finding out about the Council's services quickly and efficiently.

The new Coronavirus Vaccination Centre had opened at the Artington Park and Ride on the Old Portsmouth Road. It was open from Monday to Saturday. A symptom-free testing unit would also be opening in the rotunda on Friary Street from Wednesday with opening hours of 8am to 5pm.

Finally, Pride in Surrey would be holding its annual event on Sunday and the parade would leave the Burys Field, Godalming at 10:30am.

#### **4. APPROVAL OF THE LAND DISPOSALS POLICY AND GUIDANCE DOCUMENT**

Decision:

Melissa  
Bromham

That the Land and Property Disposal Policy and Guidance Document ('the Policy') shown in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive be approved.

Reason(s):

To adopt a formal policy in respect of the mechanism of land disposal in order to ensure that relevant legislation is complied with and enable the Council to ensure its land disposal procedures are transparent, whilst making the best use of its resources and achieving best value, therefore underpinning the Council's strategic framework and the delivery of the corporate plan.

Other options considered and rejected by the Executive:

None.

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

None.

**5. COLLECTION OF COUNCIL TAX ARREARS GOOD PRACTICE  
CITIZENS ADVICE BUREAU (CAB) PROTOCOL**

Decision:

Belinda  
Hayden

To not adopt the CAB Protocol now; but, that officers revisit the issues (including cost of compliance) when looking at future working with Waverley to ensure consistency and best practice moving forward.

Reason(s):

Having reviewed the protocol the benefits do not currently outweigh the cost of compliance, given that the Council already meets the overarching aims of the protocol and service levels are acknowledged as good. However, reviewing the issues when looking at future working with Waverley will ensure consistency and best practice moving forward.

Other options considered and rejected by the Executive:

- a Adopt the Protocol and address all the issues so that we can meet its requirements. There is a financial cost attached to this that cannot be quantified at the present time. In addition, whilst the required activities may be perceived to be “best practice” officers have not identified that they will lead to substantial benefits.
- b Do not adopt the Protocol on the basis that the Council has a good working relationship with local advice agencies and for the most part fulfil the overarching aims of each section.

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

None

**6. POLICY ON DEBT RECOVERY**

Decision:

Belinda  
Hayden

That the Corporate Debt Recovery Policy, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted by the Executive, be adopted.

Reason(s):

Adopting a short, clear policy setting out both Council and Debtor responsibilities could deliver the following benefits:

- A consistent approach across the Council, and a way forward for any customers with multiple debts
- Clarity for customers
- A tool to help in the debt collection process

Other options considered and rejected by the Executive:

None.

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

None.

## **7. COUNCILLOR EMAIL SIGNATURE GUIDANCE**

Decision:

That, subject to the amendments set out in the Supplementary Information Sheet, the Councillor Email Signature Guidance, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive, be approved.

The Executive recommended to Council (5 October 2021):

That the Council be requested to agree the following amendment to paragraph 9 of the Councillors' Code of Conduct:

- “9. In addition to compliance with this Code of Conduct, you are also expected to comply with:
- (i) the relevant requirements of the Protocol on Councillor/Officer Relations, the Social Media Guidance for Councillors, **the Councillor Email Signature Guidance**, and the Probity In Planning – Councillors' Handbook, and
  - (ii) any reasonable request by the Council that you complete a related party transaction disclosure.”

Reason(s):

To ensure clarity for the recipients of emails sent by ward councillors in which capacity they are writing.

Other options considered and rejected by the Executive:

To modify the Guidance, refer the Guidance back to the Task Group for further consideration, or decline to adopt the Guidance.

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

None

## 8. WEYSIDE URBAN VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT \*

### Decision:

- a) That the current financial position of WUV at the planning committee meeting gateway be endorsed.
- b) That the Director of Strategic Services, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Lead Councillor for Regeneration, be authorised to finalise heads of terms in accordance with those attached to the report and thereafter to negotiate, sign and complete the legal agreement with Surrey County Council in accordance with the finalised heads of terms and to proceed with implementation of the relocation of the Waste Transfer Facility accordingly.
- c) That the Director of Strategic Services, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Regeneration, be authorised to enter into such other contracts and legal agreements connected with the Weyfield Urban Village (WUV) project as may be necessary at reasonable costs within the approved budget.
- d) That the commencement of infrastructure procurement following receipt of a satisfactory planning consent pursuant to Hybrid planning application submitted on 15 December 2020 (Reference No 20/P/02155) be endorsed.
- e) That the transfer of £67.185m from the provisional capital programme to the approved capital programme for payments which the Council is obliged to make to Thames Water under the TW Agreement for 2021/22 and 2022/23, for costs necessary to meet the milestones set within the Homes England HIF agreement and design cost necessary to prepare the planning application for the SCC waste transfer facility be approved.

### Reasons:

- a) It was agreed that the project team would report the financial position of WUV at the planning committee meeting gateway.
- b) To ensure that there is sufficient funding in the approved programme to cover the phase 1 Infrastructure costs, SCC waste transfer design cost and the payments which the Council is obliged to make to TWUL under the TW Agreement for 2021/22 and 2022/23.
- c) To inform the Executive of the Commencement of Infrastructure Procurement following receipt of a satisfactory planning consent.

### Other options considered and rejected by the Executive:

None.

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

None

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.