

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held in the Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 4BB on Tuesday 7 December 2021

The Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley

* The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth (in the chair)

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Councillor Paul Abbey | Councillor Ted Mayne |
| * Councillor Tim Anderson | * Councillor Julia McShane |
| Councillor Jon Askew | * Councillor Ann McShee |
| * Councillor Christopher Barrass | * Councillor Bob McShee |
| Councillor Joss Bigmore | * Councillor Masuk Miah |
| * Councillor David Bilbé | * Councillor Ramsey Nagaty |
| * Councillor Richard Billington | Councillor Susan Parker |
| Councillor Chris Blow | Councillor George Potter |
| * Councillor Ruth Brothwell | Councillor Jo Randall |
| Councillor Colin Cross | * Councillor John Redpath |
| * Councillor Guida Esteves | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| Councillor Graham Eyre | * Councillor John Rigg |
| * Councillor Andrew Gomm | * Councillor Tony Rooth |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin | Councillor Will Salmon |
| * Councillor David Goodwin | * Councillor Deborah Seabrook |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | Councillor Pauline Searle |
| Councillor Gillian Harwood | * Councillor Paul Spooner |
| * Councillor Jan Harwood | * Councillor James Steel |
| * Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor Cait Taylor |
| * Councillor Tom Hunt | Councillor James Walsh |
| * Councillor Diana Jones | Councillor Fiona White |
| Councillor Steven Lee | * Councillor Keith Witham |
| Councillor Nigel Manning | * Councillor Catherine Young |

*Present

CO70 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley and from Councillors Paul Abbey, Jon Askew, Joss Bigmore, Chris Blow, Colin Cross, Graham Eyre, Gillian Harwood, Steven Lee, Nigel Manning, Susan Parker, George Potter, Jo Randall, Pauline Searle, Will Salmon, James Walsh, and Fiona White; and also from Honorary Aldermen Catherine Cobley, Jayne Marks, Terence Patrick, Lynda Strudwick, and Nick Sutcliffe.

CO71 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CO72 MINUTES

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the ordinary Meeting held on 5 October and Extraordinary Meeting held on 1 November 2021. The Deputy Mayor signed the minutes.

CO73 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

On behalf of the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor welcomed the new Joint Chief Executive, Tom Horwood, to his first ordinary Council meeting and wished him every success in his new role.

The Deputy Mayor informed councillors that there were a small number of tickets still available for the Mayor's Charity Christmas Concert on Sunday 12 December at Holy Trinity Church.

CO74 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

In the absence of the Leader, the Deputy Leader was pleased to inform the Council of the various festivities and events scheduled to take place over the Christmas period.

The Deputy Leader reported that having launched our crowdfunding platform in November, the first project "Create a Workshop" was held this week where people who had a project or an idea were able to receive guidance and expert advice on how to get cash to get started. A further workshop was being held on 12 January 2022.

The Deputy Leader also reported that phase 1 of the Walnut Bridge project had been completed with the bridge open for use. Work had commenced on the new ramp and steps, with the landscaping of Bedford Wharf plaza scheduled to begin in the New Year.

Councillors noted that the Council's City Bid would be submitted formally on 8 December, after which it would be placed on to the Council's website. On behalf of the Executive, the Deputy Leader thanked everyone who had worked on the Bid, and those who had supported it.

The Deputy Leader reported on the changes to the Executive, which were set out in Appendix 1 to the Order Paper and welcomed Councillor Cait Taylor as the new Lead Councillor for Climate Change.

Finally, the Deputy Leader reported that the number of Covid cases in Surrey was high but had stabilised, although the rate had decreased in Guildford, it was still higher than the national and the Surrey average. In order to prevent the spread of the virus, the Deputy Leader urged everyone to get fully vaccinated.

In response to a question as to which Lead Councillor was responsible for housing delivery, the Deputy Leader confirmed that responsibility for housing delivery would be shared between the Housing and Community, and the Regeneration portfolios.

CO75 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mr Ivor Thomas (resident of Shalford) made a statement to the Council in opposition to Surrey County Council's proposals to convert Dagley Lane, Shalford into a cycle track and to request Guildford Borough Council to raise an objection to the scheme based on environmental and financial grounds.

The Lead Councillor for Environment responded by stating that, although he shared some of these concerns, there was a strategic desire to see more cycle routes within the borough. In relation to the use of rubber sealing, there were concerns regarding its durability, but Surrey County Council had given reassurances that it would last for at least twenty years, with the first ten years under the manufacturer's warranty. Whilst the Borough Council wished to see more cycle lanes to increase accessibility, it was very important to ensure that the biodiversity of the area was not negatively impacted.

CO76 PETITION: MAKE GUILDFORD PESTICIDE-FREE

The Council considered a report on the receipt of a joint petition and e-petition, containing a combined total of 534 signatories and e-signatories, requesting the Council to '*Phase out the use of pesticides, including glyphosate, in Guildford.*'

As there were in excess of 500 signatures, the Council's Petition Scheme required the full Council to debate the matters raised by the petition/e-petition and to indicate to the petition organisers what action the Council proposed to take in response.

The report included the petition organisers' supporting statement accompanying the petition, which had stated:

"Every year, our pavements, streets, parks, playgrounds and other open spaces in Guildford are sprayed with pesticides. In particular, glyphosate is used across the borough on a regular basis. Inevitably, we as Guildford residents come into contact with these pesticides, as do our children, pets and local wildlife.

Pesticides (including glyphosate) have been linked to an array of health problems, from neurological disorders such as Parkinson's disease, cancers such as non-Hodgkin's lymphoma to autism in children. Vulnerable groups such as children, pregnant women and the elderly are most at risk of being affected.

As well as damaging human health, pesticides harm urban biodiversity. Pesticides are key contributors to the dramatic reductions in insects such as bees and other pollinators. Glyphosate has been shown to affect bees' ability to navigate, their sleep, larval development, and immunity to deadly infections. Glyphosate also kills flowering plants that bees and other insects rely on. This reduction in pollinators has far-reaching consequences for both wildlife and people.

Pesticides contaminate our water supply and harm aquatic life. They also poison our soils and harm soil invertebrates such as worms.

Urban pesticide use is unnecessary. Many towns and cities around the world have banned them. Pesticides are banned in all green public spaces across the whole of France. Copenhagen and Seattle manage their public spaces without pesticides. Councils across the UK are showing it can be done too with over 60 councils now implementing programs to phase out their use. Locally, Waverley borough, Petersfield and Chichester have all committed to phase out pesticides whilst trialling alternatives.

Well tested, cost effective and safe non-chemical alternatives to pesticides exist and are already being used in other towns locally. Using alternatives, or simply leaving some weeds in place to flower (where they do not cause a hazard) would have a positive impact on biodiversity and human health in Guildford.

We are asking Guildford Borough Council to phase out the use of pesticides, including glyphosate, in Guildford.

Please support us, sign this petition, share it with your friends and help make our town pesticide free.

This petition has been organised by Guildford Environmental Forum, a voluntary organisation that works to promote environmental protection in and around Guildford."

The co-organisers of the petition Helen Harris and Frances Rollin, who were also members of the Guildford Environmental Forum, made a statement to the Council in support of their petition. Nick Mole (Policy Officer, Pesticide Action Network UK) also addressed the meeting in support of the petition.

The Lead Councillor for Environment, Councillor James Steel proposed, and the Lead Councillor for Economy, Councillor John Redpath, seconded the following motion in response to the petition:

"This Council acknowledges the work that officers have already undertaken to minimise chemical use and to explore alternative methods of weed control. We also recognise that the current Chemical Minimisation Policy, whilst still relevant, needs review.

The Council aims to stop using chemicals and believes that the approach to be taken should be to phase out their use as quickly as is practicable, recognising that at present it may not always be possible to eliminate their use altogether.

The Council feels that a detailed chemical action plan should be developed that includes continued commitment to:

- *existing chemical reduction actions*
- *exploring alternatives*
- *communication*
- *educating site users and managing expectations*
- *working with partners to facilitate alternative approaches*

To that end, the Council therefore

RESOLVES: That the Executive be requested to urgently consider and approve the proposed chemical reduction measures in 2022 set out in Appendix 6 to the report submitted to the Council."

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Steel as the mover of the original motion, indicated that, with the consent of his seconder and of the meeting, he wished to alter his motion as follows:

- (1) Substitute the following in place of the 3rd paragraph of the motion:

"The Council aspires to becoming a pesticide and herbicide free borough (to the greatest extent possible), following an agreed three-year phase-out plan, and accordingly feels that a detailed chemical action plan should be developed that includes continued and public commitment to:

- (2) Omit the fifth bullet point.

- (3) Add the following bullet points:

- *"establishing a working group involving partners including the Pesticides Action Network and the Guildford Environmental Forum to facilitate alternative approaches*
- *Collaborating on the phasing-out of pesticide use with Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council (who have already adopted a similar policy)*
- *Incorporating the Council's chemical action plan in all relevant contracts."*

- (4) Add the following to the end of the resolution:

"and committing the Council to working with the County Council in developing a joint pesticide policy".

The motion, as altered, would read as follows:

"This Council acknowledges the work that officers have already undertaken to minimise chemical use and to explore alternative methods of weed control. We also recognise that the current Chemical Minimisation Policy, whilst still relevant, needs review.

The Council aims to stop using chemicals and believes that the approach to be taken should be to phase out their use as quickly as is practicable, recognising that at present it may not always be possible to eliminate their use altogether.

The Council aspires to becoming a pesticide and herbicide free borough (to the greatest extent possible), following an agreed three-year phase-out plan, and accordingly feels that a detailed chemical action plan should be developed that includes continued and public commitment to:

- *existing chemical reduction actions*
- *exploring alternatives*
- *communication*
- *educating site users and managing expectations*
- *establishing a working group involving partners including the Pesticides Action Network and the Guildford Environmental Forum to facilitate alternative approaches*
- *Collaborating on the phasing-out of pesticide use with Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council (who have already adopted a similar policy)*
- *Incorporating the Council's chemical action plan in all relevant contracts.*

To that end, the Council therefore

RESOLVES: That the Executive be requested to urgently consider and approve the proposed chemical reduction measures in 2022 set out in Appendix 6 to the report submitted to the Council and committing the Council to working with the County Council in developing a joint pesticide policy”.

The Council agreed to accept the alteration to the original motion, as indicated above. The motion, as altered, therefore became the substantive motion for debate.

Following the debate on the substantive motion, but before the vote was taken on it, Nick Mole, on behalf of the petition organisers, exercised their right of reply on the debate.

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Council's response to the petition is as follows:

“This Council acknowledges the work that officers have already undertaken to minimise chemical use and to explore alternative methods of weed control. We also recognise that the current Chemical Minimisation Policy, whilst still relevant, needs review.

The Council aims to stop using chemicals and believes that the approach to be taken should be to phase out their use as quickly as is practicable, recognising that at present it may not always be possible to eliminate their use altogether.

The Council aspires to becoming a pesticide and herbicide free borough (to the greatest extent possible), following an agreed three-year phase-out plan, and accordingly feels that a detailed chemical action plan should be developed that includes continued and public commitment to:

- existing chemical reduction actions
- exploring alternatives
- communication
- educating site users and managing expectations
- establishing a working group involving partners including the Pesticides Action Network and the Guildford Environmental Forum to facilitate alternative approaches

- Collaborating on the phasing-out of pesticide use with Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council (who have already adopted a similar policy)
- Incorporating the Council's chemical action plan in all relevant contracts.

To that end, the Council therefore

RESOLVES: That the Executive be requested to urgently consider and approve the proposed chemical reduction measures in 2022 set out in Appendix 6 to the report submitted to the Council and committing the Council to working with the County Council in developing a joint pesticide policy”.

CO77 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

There were no questions from councillors.

CO78 REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION ON LOCAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES

The Council considered a report on The Local Plan: Development Management Policies (hereafter referred to as ‘the draft Local Plan’), which was the second part of Guildford’s Local Plan. Once adopted it would, together with the adopted Local Plan: Strategy and Sites document (LPSS), fully supersede the existing Local Plan 2003 and become part of the Council’s Development Plan. The draft Local Plan provided the more detailed policies to be used by Development Management in the determination of planning applications. Councillors noted that the LPSS included a small number of development management policies where these were necessary in implementing the strategic policies, for examples in relation to Green Belt, employment and retail.

The structure of the draft Local Plan was consistent with that contained in the LPSS. The chapters therefore consisted of: Housing, Protecting, Economy, Design, and Infrastructure and Delivery. A list of all the proposed policies and a brief summary of any changes in the policy approach compared to the Regulation 18 version was contained in Appendix 1 to the report.

The Regulation 18 consultation had included both ‘issues and options’ and went on to suggest a ‘preferred option’ for each policy. This approach was designed to generate meaningful comments and concerns, which it did and now enabled the Council to move straight to a Regulation 19 ‘proposed submission’ document. This in turn would increase the possibility of being able to progress the plan to Examination without the need for main modifications and a further round of consultation.

There had been limited significant changes in the policy approaches set out in the Regulation 18 version; however, there were some notable changes, and these had been categorised in the following ways: refinement of policy approach, presentational/ structural changes, new policies, deleted policies and changes in policy approach from the preferred Regulation 18 approach to an alternative option.

The Regulation 19 consultation period would run for six weeks from early January to mid-February 2022.

The report had also sought permission to consult upon a Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for a four-week period. This document would be consulted upon, but not adopted. The issue of whether its content should form part of the DPD or be a standalone SPD would be put to the Inspector at the Examination in Public.

Councillors noted that this matter was considered by the Executive at its meeting held on 23 November 2021. The Executive had endorsed the recommendation in the report, subject to further investigation as to the merits of extending the requirement for design codes to all housing sites allocated in the Development Plan. Details of the outcome of that investigation were set out in Order Paper circulated at the meeting.

The Lead Councillor for Regeneration, Councillor John Rigg proposed, and Councillor Liz Hogger seconded the motion set out in the Order Paper. During the debate, whilst there was an acceptance that the Council should proceed to the Regulation 19 consultation without further delay, there were still ongoing concerns over the need for policies to address climate change, preservation of ancient woodland, and infilling.

The Council, having considered the report and the draft Local Plan

RESOLVED:

(1) That the draft Local Plan: Development Management Policies document which accompanied the agenda for the extraordinary Council meeting held on 1 November, including the changes to that document referred to in Appendix 2 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved for Regulation 19 public consultation for a period of six-weeks beginning in early January 2022, subject to the following amendments:

(i) Add the following wording to Policy D4

'Masterplanning and Design Codes

8) Strategic sites listed in LPSS 2019 Policy D1(13) are Required to produce masterplans and follow a Design Code approach through the planning application process. This will require a Design Code to be agreed prior to the granting of full or reserved matters planning permission for any phase of the development. Where outline planning permission has been agreed subject to Design Code agreement, any relevant Reserved Matters applications which are submitted without the Design Code being agreed will be refused.

9) Masterplans and Design Codes will also be required for any site that will be developed in more than one phase or by more than one developer. Failure to agree a Design Code approach is likely to result in the refusal of an application.

10) A design code will be required for any other site or part of a site where it is considered necessary to set design parameters.'

(ii) Add the following text to the reasoned justification to the policy:

'5. 19 Masterplans and Design Codes will also be required on other sites as specified in the policy in order to deliver schemes that are designed in a comprehensive manner. This will ensure that matters such as the design and location of roads, cycle and pedestrian links, open space, services and facilities are all considered holistically across the wider site. It is also important that any development proposal considers the way in which it will knit into the existing settlement fabric, promoting interconnectedness and avoiding sterilising the future development potential of adjoining land. The need to set design parameters in design codes is most likely to be required where there is design uncertainty, such as in the case of outline or hybrid planning applications for development sites.'

(iii) Amend the wording of the proposed LPDMP Policy ID11 at point e) so that it reads as follows:

'the provision of electric vehicle charging will provide at least the minimum requirements set out in the Parking SPD; and'

- (2) That the draft Parking Supplementary Planning Document, be approved for public consultation for a four-week period beginning in January 2022.
- (3) That the Lead Councillor with portfolio responsibility for Planning Policy be authorised, in consultation with the Director of Strategic Services,
 - (a) to amend:
 - (i) the draft Parking SPD to include standards for Electric Vehicle Charge Points (EVCP) for strategic sites (alongside EVCP standards for non-strategic sites, which are already in the draft Parking SPD), and
 - (ii) the guidance within the draft Parking SPD to reflect the Government's proposed new EVCP requirements for both strategic sites and non-strategic sites.
 - (b) to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the documents referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) above, as they may deem necessary.
- (4) That if, in due course, and based on appropriate evidence, the Council wishes to introduce more stringent EVCP requirements, an updated Parking SPD be brought forward for consultation and potential adoption.

Reason:

The recommendations above are made to encourage the Council to:

- 1) Enable the draft Local Plan: Development Management Policies document to be published for public consultation.
- 2) Allow officers to undertake public consultation in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015, the National Planning Practice Guidance, and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement 2020.

Undertaking a public consultation on the draft Local Plan is a statutory requirement placed on Local Planning Authorities under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 ('Local Planning Regulations') and will enable the Council to move closer to adopting the second part of the Local Plan as required by law and policy.

CO79 GAMBLING ACT 2005: STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES 2022-25

Councillors noted that the Gambling Act 2005 required the Council, as licensing authority, to prepare and publish a Statement of Principles every three years. The existing Statement of Principles had been published in January 2019 and was due for renewal by January 2022.

The Council considered a report on the proposed adoption of the Statement of Principles covering 2022-25.

The Licensing Committee had approved an updated draft Statement of Principles, with no material changes proposed, for public consultation on 26 May 2021. Following the consultation, three responses had been received details of which were included in the report.

This matter had been considered by the Licensing Committee at its meeting on 24 November 2021. The Committee had endorsed the recommendation in the report to adopt the Statement.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Environment, Councillor James Steel, seconded by the Chairman of the Licensing Committee, Councillor David Goodwin, the Council

RESOLVED: That the draft Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles 2022-25, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

Reason:

To comply with the requirements of the Gambling Act 2005 the Council must prepare, consult on, and approve a statement of principles for the period 2022-25.

CO80 LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2022-23

The Council considered a report on its statutory duty to determine annually whether to revise its Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTSS), replace it with another or make no changes. The Council was obliged to consult with interested parties if it wished to revise or replace the scheme. The Council must approve a scheme for the 2022-23 financial year by 31 January 2022, to enable annual bills to be calculated correctly.

The Council noted that the LCTSS currently helped around 4,500 households by providing £5.8 million of support. The cost of the scheme was shared with Surrey County Council, with Guildford's share being around 10%.

In 2021-22, a number of minor changes were made to the scheme. For 2022-23 the following changes with a revenue cost of £2,500 had been proposed:

- Increase Personal Allowances and Premiums to ensure that the help given did not unduly reduce due to inflation.
- Increase Non-Dependant Deductions to reflect an expectation that their contribution to the household expenses should increase each year.
- Continue to remove the cap on Band E entitlement for 2022-23 to provide additional help during the pandemic. This would allow anyone in a Band E property who was eligible for 100% help to receive 100% instead of having the help restricted to a maximum of a lower banded Band D property.

Changes to Personal Allowances, Premiums and the Band E restriction would increase the cost of the scheme. The nature of changing caseload and personal circumstances of claimants meant that officers had forecast that the increase could be accommodated within the existing revenue budget.

A stakeholder consultation carried out during September to October 2021 had received a low response rate, but Surrey County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner for Surrey supported the changes proposed for 2022.

The Council had increased the discretionary hardship fund for 2021-22 in anticipation of an increase in unemployment levels and calls for help. Whilst only half way through the year, with continuing uncertainty, the economic outlook was much more positive with the likelihood that the additional funds not being required. Accordingly, officers had proposed that the hardship fund should return to its normal £40,000. This should still provide sufficient funds for any additional applications that may result from the end of furlough or with increased caseload as a result of business failures.

The Council noted that, in 2020, the government had provided COVID19 Council Tax Hardship Funds, which were separate from the LCTS Hardship Fund and allowed the Council to support

taxpayers with additional Council Tax discounts. Given that a taxpayer could not receive more than a 100% reduction, and as a large percentage already received 100% LCTS, the Council did not spend all the funds and had carried them forward to provide additional support in 2021. It was forecast that funds would remain at the end of 2021, and it was proposed that these should again be carried forward to provide further discounts in 2022.

The Strategy and Resources EAB had considered the complexities of LCTS at its meeting on 14 June. They were asked to provide feedback of key areas they would like officers to either leave untouched or look at in more detail. The EAB had requested officers to look at the recalculation linked to Universal Credit. This was a complex matter and would be considered as part of the longer Future Options review.

The Council also noted that the Executive had considered the report at its meeting on 23 November 2021 and had endorsed the recommendation therein.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, the Council:

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the current Local Council Tax Support Scheme be amended for 2022-23, as set out in detail in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, with effect from 1 April 2022.
- (2) That the Council maintains a discretionary hardship fund of £40,000 in 2022-23, and carries forward any residual 2020 and 2021 COVID19 Council Tax Hardship Funds.

Reasons:

- (1) To ensure that the Council complies with legislation to implement a Local Council Tax Support Scheme from 1 April 2022.
- (2) To maintain a discretionary fund to help applicants suffering from severe financial hardship.

CO81 APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL AUDITORS

Councillors noted that the current arrangements regarding the appointment of the Council's external auditors would end on 31 March 2023. The Council considered a report on proposals for appointing the external auditor for the five-year period from 2023-24.

The Council was informed that Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) was now undertaking a procurement for the next appointing period, covering audits for 2023-24 to 2027-28. During Autumn 2021 all local government bodies would need to make decisions about their external audit arrangements from 2023-24. The options available were to arrange their own procurement and make the appointment themselves or in conjunction with other bodies, or they could join and take advantage of the national collective scheme administered by PSAA.

Officers considered that the sector-wide procurement conducted by PSAA would produce better outcomes and would be less burdensome for the Council than a procurement undertaken locally because:

- collective procurement reduced costs for the sector and for individual authorities compared to a multiplicity of smaller local procurements;
- if the national appointment arrangements were not used, the Council would need to establish its own auditor panel with an independent chair and independent members to oversee a local auditor procurement and ongoing management of an audit contract;

- it was the best opportunity to secure the appointment of a qualified, registered auditor; and
- supporting the sector-led body offered the best way of ensuring there was a continuing and sustainable public audit market into the medium and long term.

If the Council wished to take advantage of the national auditor appointment arrangements, it was required under the local audit regulations to make the decision at full Council. The opt-in period had started on 22 September 2021 and would close on 11 March 2022.

At its meeting on 18 November, the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee had considered this report and had endorsed the recommendation in the report.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson, seconded by the Chairman of the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee, Councillor George Potter, the Council:

RESOLVED: That the Council accepts Public Sector Audit Appointments' invitation to opt in to the sector-led option for the appointment of external auditors to principal local government and police bodies for five financial years from 1 April 2023.

Reason:

To enable the Council to comply with statutory obligations under Section 7 of the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014.

CO82 REVIEW OF THE NUMERICAL ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES TO POLITICAL GROUPS: 2021-22

The Council received the report of the proper officer (Democratic Services and Elections Manager) on the review of the allocation of seats on committees following receipt, on 3 November 2021, of a notice in writing from Councillor Jan Harwood and the Leader of the Conservative group on the Council that, with immediate effect, Councillor Harwood wished to be treated as a member of the Conservative group.

Consequently, the political balance on the Council was now:

Guildford Liberal Democrats: 16
Residents for Guildford and Villages: 16
Conservatives: 10
Guildford Greenbelt Group: 4
Labour: 2

Under Council Procedure Rule 23, whenever there was a change in the political constitution of the Council, the Council must, as soon as reasonably practicable, review the allocation of seats on committees to political groups.

The report included a suggested numerical allocation of seats on committees to political groups that would best meet, as far as reasonably practicable, the requirements for political balance for the remainder of the 2021-22 Municipal Year.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Economy, Councillor John Redpath, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, the Council

RESOLVED: That, in the light of the change in the political constitution of the Council described in the report submitted to the Council, the proposed revision to the calculation of the numerical allocation of seats on committees to political groups for the remainder of the 2021-22 Municipal Year, as set out in the table below, be approved:

| Committee | Lib Dem | R4GV | Con | GGG | Lab |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Total no. of seats on the Council | 16 | 16 | 10 | 4 | 2 |
| % of no. of seats on the Council | 33.33% | 33.33% | 20.83% | 8.33% | 4.17% |
| Notional no. of seats on cttees (Total: 89) | 30 | 30 | 19 | 7 | 4 |
| Corp Gov & Standards Committee (7 seats) | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Employment Cttee (3 seats) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Service Delivery EAB (12 seats) | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Strategy & Resources EAB (12 seats) | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Guildford Joint Committee (10 seats) | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Licensing Committee (15 seats) | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Overview & Scrutiny Committee (12 seats) | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Planning Committee (15 seats) | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| Joint Appointments Committee (3 seats) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Total no. of seats on committees | 30 | 30 | 18 | 7 | 4 |

Reason:

To enable the Council to comply with Council Procedure Rule 23 in respect of the requirement to review as soon as reasonably practicable the allocation of seats on committees whenever there is a change on the political constitution of the Council.

CO83 SELECTION OF THE MAYOR AND THE DEPUTY MAYOR 2022-23

It was noted that it was the Council's normal practice for the nominees for the Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the next succeeding municipal year to absent themselves from the meeting for consideration of this item of business. As the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth (who was in the chair for the meeting in the absence of the Mayor), would have to leave the meeting, the Council

RESOLVED: That Councillor Paul Spooner be elected chairman of the meeting for this item of business.

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth and Councillor Masuk Miah both left the meeting.

Councillor Spooner in the chair.

The Council considered a report on nominations received for election of Mayor and appointment of Deputy Mayor for the municipal year 2022-23. The Executive had also considered the report at its meeting on 23 November 2021 and had commended the nominations of Councillors Booth and Miah respectively for Mayor and Deputy Mayor in 2022-23.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth be nominated for the Mayoralty of the Borough for the 2022-23 municipal year.
- (2) That Councillor Masuk Miah be nominated for the Deputy Mayoralty of the Borough for the 2022-23 municipal year.

Reason:

To make early preparations for the selection of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the municipal year 2022-23.

The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth and Councillor Masuk Miah both returned to the meeting, and the Deputy Mayor resumed the chair.

CO84 NOTICE OF MOTION A: ENDING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS

The Council

RESOLVED: That the motion be withdrawn.

CO85 NOTICE OF MOTION B: PENSION FUND DIVESTMENT FROM FOSSIL FUELS

The Council

RESOLVED: That the motion be withdrawn.

CO86 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 24 August, 21 September, and 26 October 2021.

CO87 COMMON SEAL

The Council

RESOLVED: That the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to any documents to give effect to any decisions taken by the Council at this meeting.

The meeting finished at 8.47 pm

Signed

Mayor

Date