

STATEMENT OF EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

Tuesday, 22nd March, 2022

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)) *

Vice-Chairman:

Councillor Julia McShane ((Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Community and Housing)) *

Councillor Tim Anderson, (Lead Councillor for Resources) *

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

Councillor John Redpath, (Lead Councillor for Economy) *

Councillor John Rigg, (Lead Councillor for Regeneration) *

Councillor James Steel, (Lead Councillor for Environment)

Councillor Cait Taylor, (Lead Councillor for Climate Change)

*Present

Councillors Angela Goodwin, Ramsey Nagaty, Paul Spooner and Catherine Young were also in remote attendance.

Agenda Item No.

Officer(s) to action Item

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Cait Taylor, Lead Councillor for Climate Change and Councillor James Steel, Lead Councillor for Environment.

2. LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 February 2022 were confirmed as a correct record. The Chairman signed the minutes.

4. LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader of the Council referred to the war in Ukraine and confirmed that Guildford Borough Council would do its best to offer support to those in need of assistance. Further guidance about the 'Homes for Ukraine' scheme was expected soon. The scheme was launched by the government on 14 March and enabled individuals, businesses and charities to sponsor those who did not have family links in the UK. It was noted that residents offering to sponsor a nominated individual to safety would not have their council tax benefits and discounts affected by their participation. The council had registered to be a part of the scheme and there would be discussions with Surrey County Council about how the £10,500 fund allocated per person would be spent.

[Homes for Ukraine – Homes for Ukraine – Local Sponsorship Scheme for Ukraine \(campaign.gov.uk\)](https://campaign.gov.uk)

It was noted that Covid was again on the rise locally. The Leader urged residents to get vaccinated, ventilate rooms, wear face coverings in crowded places, stay at home and get tested if they had symptoms and wash hands regularly.

'Build Guildford' was a new interactive display at Guildford Museum running from 26 March to 7 May. A model of the town would be created using recycled cardboard boxes or cards. There would be facilitated workshops where visitors could make a building to add to the display.

The display 'Soldiers of Surrey: Stories from The Queen's Royal Regiment' by the Surrey Infantry Collection was also still running. Guildford Museum was open Wednesday to Saturdays from 12-4:30pm.

5. TO CONSIDER ANY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Leader of the Council invited the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to comment on the new standing item on the agenda. The Chairman of the committee welcomed the report.

Tom
Horwood

The members of the Executive described the report as a very useful summary and agreed and endorsed the recommendations as set out.

6. PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER AMENDMENT

Decision:

- (1) That the variation of the existing town centre Public Spaces Protection Order, as set in Appendices 1 and 2 to the report submitted to the Executive, including the extension of

Yasmine
Makin

geographical area and variation in behaviours, be approved.

- (2) That the proposed actions set out in Appendix 3 to the report, which aimed to address the outstanding actions raised during the review of the Public Spaces Protection Order, be approved.

Reasons:

- (1) The Council had demonstrated that it had undertaken the statutory process to be satisfied on reasonable grounds that:
 - activities had taken place that had a detrimental effect on the quality of life for those in the localities identified, or it was likely that activities would take place and that they would have a detrimental effect, and
 - the effect or likely effect of those activities:
 - was, or was likely to be, persistent or continuing in nature,
 - was, or was likely to be, unreasonable, and
 - justified the restrictions being imposed.
- (2) The PSPO review highlighted behaviours that were not appropriate for inclusion in a PSPO and would be better addressed with other tools or existing powers.
- (3) The PSPO review presented evidence of a lack of awareness of the existing PSPO and an absence of a robust enforcement policy to respond appropriately to breaches.

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. DAY CARE PROVISION FOR THE ELDERLY *

Decision:

- (1) That the provision of day care services for the elderly be consolidated at The Hive to maintain high quality service provision for all residents in the borough.
- (2) That the following recommendations from the Service Delivery EAB be actioned by the Head of Community Services:
 - a) The possibility of introducing a lunch provision at

Japonica Court be explored to support those residents who previously accessed the lunch club at the Shawfield Centre.

- b) A breakdown of the projected revenue savings of £170,000 be provided to the Service Delivery EAB to clarify the amount of funding expected to be saved from the Shawfield Centre closure, balanced against any rise in costs associated with an increase in the use of The Hive and community transport and any ongoing upkeep of the building including utility payments.

- (3) That the Head of Asset Management be requested to develop a project mandate in respect of the options for the future use of the Shawfield Centre site without delay to prevent a community facility falling into disuse for a length of time, one of which should consider the operation of the property by an external organisation such as a parish council, charity or local enterprise.

Reason:

To maintain or improve the quality of provision for day centre customers, whilst reducing costs as part of our savings strategy.

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.

8. PRE-ELECTION PERIOD PUBLICITY POLICY

Decision:

To recommend that full Council (on 5 April 2022) approves the Pre-Election Period Publicity Policy, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Executive, with immediate effect.

Stephen
Rix

Reasons:

To protect the interests of the Council, and to provide guidance to Councillors and Officers on publicity and the use of Council resources during the Pre-Election Period.

Other options considered and rejected by the Executive:

- To not adopt the Policy and continue with the status quo.
- To ask for amendments to be made to the Policy and a further

version to be drafted.

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 Joint Chief Executive 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

(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.