

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 5 April, 2022

* The Mayor, Councillor Marsha Moseley (Mayor)

* The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| * 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

Honorary Alderman David Wright was also in attendance

CO106 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Christopher Barrass, Richard Billington, Liz Hogger, Steven Lee, Ann McShee, and Cait Taylor, and also from Honorary Freeman Andrew Hodges and David Watts, and Honorary Aldermen Tamsy Baker, Catherine Copley, Sarah Creedy, Vas Kapsalis, Jayne Marks, Terence Patrick, Tony Phillips, Lynda Strudwick, Keith Taylor, and Jenny Wicks.

CO107 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosable pecuniary interests.

Councillor Fiona White and Councillor Keith Witham each declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 15 on the agenda – Notice of Motion Dated 24 March 2022: Surrey Police and Crime Panel (see Minute No. CO120 below). Councillor White was the Borough Council's representative on the Surrey Police and Crime Panel and Councillor Witham represented Surrey County Council on the Surrey Police and Crime Panel.

CO108 MINUTES

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the budget meeting held on 9 February 2022. The Mayor signed the minutes.

CO109 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor thanked the Circle 8 Film Group for the wonderful film show and Greyfriars Vineyard who generously sponsored the Mayor's charity Film & Fizz Night, together with those councillors who came along to support the event, which raised just over £1000 for the Mayor's chosen charities.

The Mayor reminded councillors that her Charity Ball would be taking place on Saturday 23 April, and that there were still some spaces available.

The Mayor had recently hosted a reception to thank the Town Centre Guides for the exceptional work they did in promoting the heritage of the town centre which in turn supported the local economy of the town.

Earlier in the month, the Mayor had attended the Inspiring Women Concert at Guildford Cathedral, which had been staged by Hennessy Brown Music as part of the Cathedral's Diamond Jubilee celebrations. The event had also celebrated the International Women' Day weekend.

Last month, the Mayor had attended the installation of the new High Sheriff for Surrey, His Honour Christopher Critchlow DL, who was the Council's Honorary Recorder from 2010 until he retired as the Resident Judge at Guildford Crown Court in 2016. The Mayor congratulated the new High Sheriff and wished him well for the coming year.

The Mayor referred to the shocking and horrifying situation in Ukraine and informed the Council that she had attended St Mary's Church in Quarry Street for their Friday Night vigil, lighting a candle for hope and praying for an early end to the unnecessary bloodshed.

CO110 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader commented on the information on the Council's website on supporting those affected by the war in Ukraine. The Council had registered its interest in the Homes for Ukraine sponsorship programme, which allowed individuals, charities, community groups, and businesses to bring Ukrainians to safety, including those with no family ties to the UK. The Council was currently working with Surrey County Council and Waverley Borough Council on a detailed process for the accommodation and criminal checks required.

The Leader was pleased to report that the planning permission granted by the Planning Committee last year in respect of the Weyside Urban Village had been issued on 31 March 2022, following completion of the work by the project team and officers from Surrey County Council and National Highways to comply with the various conditions and outstanding highways issues. This would allow the next phase of the work to progress including the submission of a planning application for a new Council Depot later this year.

The Leader was also pleased to report that Surrey County Council had approved the Council's bids to the Empty Homes Fund which had secured £696,000 revenue support for various projects.

The Leader reported that the Council had entered into a temporary lease of the unused kitchen at Millmead House with Neat2Eat, which was a social enterprise set up to employ and train young adults in the age range of 18 to 24 who were not currently in education or employment.

Millmead House would become a cloud kitchen to train apprentices in the catering industry and to support young entrepreneurs at the start of their business journeys. The food produced at Millmead would supply several cafes and outlets operated by Need2Eat and support its Holiday Hunger and other food programmes for those in need.

Finally, the Leader took the opportunity of thanking the Mayor and Councillor Manning for their outstanding commitment to the Guildford Mayoralty over the past year.

CO111 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No members of the public had indicated a wish to ask a question or make a statement to the Council.

CO112 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- (a) Councillor Paul Spooner asked the Lead Councillor for Environment, Councillor James Steel, the question set out below.

“Central Government Changing Places Fund (first round) outcomes were announced on 24 March making up to £30m available to local authorities to boost the provision of Changing Places (accessible) toilets in existing buildings. The announcement on 24 March will deliver over 500 new Changing Places toilets.

Every local authority that submitted an eligible expression of interest has received at least £40,000 in funding. Guildford Borough Council did not receive funding as they did not submit a formal expression of interest.

I would like to ask the Lead Councillor, at a time that the Executive are closing public toilets and affecting some of our most vulnerable residents in a significant way, why the opportunity for funding was not progressed, particularly given the fund prospectus stated a commitment that all local authorities who submitted bids would receive at least £40,000. Does the Lead Councillor agree that this is a double blow for the elderly, disabled and for those who need toilets?”

The Lead Councillor’s response was as follows:

“We are very proud that within the current administration we were able to help facilitate, and part fund the provision of the first two public Changing Places toilets within the borough. The first opened in the Friary Centre on 22 January 2020 and the second within Guildford Baptist Church on 10 October 2020, for which the Council contributed funding of £10,000 and £3,500 respectively.

Of course, it would have been better for our finances had government grant funding been available sooner, but the opportunity to help some of the most vulnerable in our society came sooner than the grant. We recognised the value of supporting these improvements and did so without hesitation. Unfortunately, there were no mechanisms within the grant funding to support recently completed projects and the process only realistically allowed for applications for relatively advanced proposals that happened to be near ready in the short two-month period between the announcement of the funding and the closing of the fund.

To be clear, this fund is not directly relevant to the current public toilets in Guildford borough that are being proposed for closure as they are not of sufficient size.

We have had to make changes to the number of our public toilets we provide in order to make some savings; however, we have carried out a careful review and undertaken an

extensive consultation which has materially altered the outcomes. Whilst a number of toilets will close there is still extensive Council and other provision, especially in the town centre and all our current operational toilets in our parks remain untouched”.

In response to a supplementary question enquiring as to what other operational toilets across the borough could have, or should have, been considered in relation to possible grant funding, the Lead Councillor stated that the short time frame of the consultation hampered our ability to look at other sites. The Lead Councillor also confirmed that reference to “*extensive Council and other provision*” in his written response referred to users’ ability to access a range of toilet facilities in the town centre and at park locations.

- (b) Councillor Graham Eyre asked the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson, the question set out below. (Councillor Anderson’s response to each element of the question is set out in **red type** below).

- (i) *How much did the Council spend on agency and temporary staff in 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22?*

“The details are set out in the tables below:

	AGENCY STAFF SPEND		
	2019-20	2020-21	2021
			total to date
DIRECTORATE			
	£	£	£
HRA REVENUE	33,761	18,321	156,489
RESOURCE	431,924	913,178	658,651
SERVICES	1,283,547	2,119,582	1,859,767
STRATEGY	229,013	303,005	324,903
GF REVENUE	1,978,245	3,354,086	2,999,811
HRACAP	111,014	17,063	133,246
GFCAP	628,717	727,152	835,144
TOTAL CAPITAL	739,731	744,215	968,390
TOTAL AGENCY SPEND	2,717,976	4,098,301	3,968,200

	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22 to date
	£	£	£
TOTAL AGENCY	2,717,976	4,098,301	3,968,200
TOTAL			
Temporary Staff	555,738	418,302	574,155
Grand Total	3,273,714	4,516,603	4,542,355

NB ***2021 total to date is up until 29/3/22***

Services – to 29/03/22

<i>Planning staff (Development Control and Building Control):</i>	<i>£427,000</i>
<i>Corporate Programmes staff (not yet chargeable to capital):</i>	<i>£315,000</i>
<i>Refuse staff:</i>	<i>£375,000</i>
<i>Street Cleaning staff:</i>	<i>£189,000</i>

(ii) *Is the Council planning to reduce this amount in the current 2022-23 financial year?*

“Yes, we wish to reduce agency staff spend. However, there is an ongoing recruitment issue across this Council (and indeed in many councils) where posts have not been able to be recruited to despite a number of recruitment drives. We have struggled to recruit various professional roles across a number of services and sometimes experience a lack of appropriately qualified or experienced candidates in the market for the rates that we are able to offer. We are therefore looking at potential training schemes for hard to fill roles. In order to deliver projects and maintain the ambitious Capital Programme, temporary/agency staff are utilised.

A breakdown of agency spend by project is set out in the table below. It should also be noted that many of our capital projects receive substantial external funding – e.g. Weyside Urban Village £52m HIF Grant. Grant income can only be used on the specific projects for which we have received the funding. It cannot be used for other purposes.”

(iii) *How much has the Future Guildford project influenced the need for agency and temporary staff over the past 2 years?*

“Due to the recruitment issues outlined, agency/temporary staff are needed to fill resource gaps where recruitment has not been successful, to cover maternity leave or to fill roles associated with Projects of a specific length if we are to continue to provide an acceptable service to our residents. Some temporary and agency were employed as part of Future Guildford to deliver the project in 2020-21 but they have since left the Council. The staff establishment structure following Future Guildford has identified a number of posts which can be recruited to permanently which were previously temporary or agency roles – e.g. in Corporate Programmes to deliver the Capital Programme. This recruitment is underway”.

In response to a supplementary question as to whether he was embarrassed by the amount of money spent on temporary and agency staff, the Lead Councillor stated that whilst he was not embarrassed, he did share the concern about the level of expenditure on consultants and agency staff. It was noted that although professionals in respect of certain roles were in very high demand locally, the provision of temporary professional staff for major projects had been covered by external grant funding.

In response to a further question the Leader confirmed that exit interviews were conducted when staff leave the Council and informed councillors that in comparison with other councils, Guildford’s staff turnover was relatively low.

(c) Councillor Jan Harwood asked the Lead Councillor for Climate Change, Councillor Cait Taylor, the question set out below. (Councillor Taylor’s response to each element of the question is set out in **red type** below).

(i) *Has the Council completed its procurement of a green energy supplier as initiated over a year ago?*

“We were examining our opportunity to sign up for a green tariff, or basket of tariffs that would enable part of the energy supplies used by the Council to have a green origin to even out the higher cost of a green tariff. The aim was to purchase this via the Council’s energy broker, LASER. However, it was not straightforward in that there was a balance required between paying for the higher cost for greener energy and ensuring we kept within budget as part of the Savings Strategy.

At one point the discussions with LASER were delayed from their end and since our climate change officer left the Council in September 2021, we have been unable to revisit this workstream. However, we do want to pursue greener energy procurement and will be entering discussions with LASER again shortly. For information, further information on LASER's services can be viewed via the following links:

[Zero Carbon \(laserenergy.org.uk\)](https://www.laserenergy.org.uk)

[Replace \(laserenergy.org.uk\)](https://www.laserenergy.org.uk)

- (ii) *How does the Council intend to source 100% renewable energy for its own operations?*

“This is part of the wider ongoing work to secure the best options for reducing CO₂ equivalent emissions from the Council's operations and energy reduction. To provide an exact answer to this specific question is not possible at this point in time”.

In response to a supplementary question which sought:

- (i) justification for not continuing with the workstream given that the remaining work was for the procurement team, rather than the climate change officer; and
- (ii) clarification as to how it was intended to meet the requirements of the Council's Energy Strategy by achieving a mix of clean energy procurement with green energy renewable projects, in particular how it was proposed to close the gap between what has already been achieved and the projects remaining, for example, by way of more procurement or pursuing a strategy of building more renewable in the borough

the Leader confirmed that, in view of the absence of the Lead Councillor for Climate Change, a written response would be sent to Councillor Harwood after the meeting.

- (d) Councillor Nigel Manning asked the Lead Councillor for Environment, Councillor James Steel, the following question:

“This Administration has decided to close public toilets as part of a cost cutting exercise and to completely remove the public toilet grants to both Shere and Ash Parish Councils from 1 April 2022. 4 public toilets have been identified for closure, including the one at Ripley. In the GBC press release dated 29 March 2022, it states that Ripley Parish have agreed to the taking on of the cleaning and maintenance of the Ripley public toilet from 4 April, although it does not say which year!! What year is this to be?”

In addition, I understand the Ripley public toilet is a freehold asset owned by GBC. Who is going to pick up the cost of business rates, water rates and insurance on this property?

What other payments, if any, have GBC made or agreed to make, whether to Ripley Parish Council or others, in respect of the Ripley public toilets? Over what period are these payments going to be made?”

The Lead Councillor's response was as follows:

“As part of the consultation process, Ripley Parish Council expressed a strong wish to continue having a facility within the parish and were willing to take on the provision directly if the Borough Council decided that Ripley was a facility chosen for closure. They highlighted that due to the timings and their current budget and financial position they would need some transitional support to cover operating costs until they were in a position to finance this facility fully themselves. By providing some transitional support now, as a one off, this would give the opportunity for the provision to continue

uninterrupted, rather than close now and potentially reopen in the future when Ripley Parish Council could afford to do so.

Having listened carefully to the consultation responses from Ripley, on balance we considered that a one-off payment now and continuing service was a valuable benefit to residents and visitors to Ripley whilst allowing the Borough Council to make long term structural savings in costs without delay. We have agreed a one-off payment of £15,000 to help transition the facility into the Parish Council's control. As part of this we will need to transfer or lease the building to the Parish Council and this work has started. There was insufficient time to complete this legal work prior to the changes introduced with effect from 4 April 2022, but these will be completed in the normal manner in due course.

In the interim, the Parish Council will undertake the cleaning, opening and closing of the toilets from 4 April 2022, and this will allow the Borough Council to immediately adjust its staffing and vehicles to deliver the operational savings we have identified. We will continue to cover the small cost of utilities, repairs and insurance until the facility is passed to Ripley, at which point the Borough Council will not be involved in this facility in any shape or form and there will be no other future payments or ongoing costs falling to Guildford beyond the transfer and this one-off transitional support payment.

There is no business rates liability for the Ripley public toilets, this was as a result of changes to legislation in 2021 - Non-Domestic Rating (Public Lavatories) Act 2021 which Zero rated buildings that were wholly or mainly public toilets from April 2020.

In order to save the Borough Council significant costs of overtime and fuel associated with locking and unlocking toilets, Ripley Parish Council has provided a locking and unlocking service to our toilets in Ripley for a number of years in return for £2,000 per year; this arrangement will cease as of 3 April 2022. There are no other payments or agreements to Ripley Parish Council in regard to the Ripley toilets other than the planned transfer of responsibility and transitional support which we aim to complete as soon as possible”.

In response to the following supplementary questions:

- (i) why the Council had given Ripley Parish Council a grant of £15,000, which equated to almost two years' worth of costs relating to the Ripley toilet, when Ash and Shere Parish Councils were expected to cover the cost of running their toilets by raising their precepts;
- (ii) why this grant payment was not included in the Council's press release dated 29 March 2022 regarding Ripley Parish Council taking over the maintenance and cleaning of Ripley toilet;
- (iii) what would happen if Ripley Parish Council decided not to take the lease or the freehold of the Ripley toilets, presumably the Borough Council would have to pick up the cost of utilities, insurance, and repairs;
- (iv) whether Ripley Parish Council would cover the Council's legal costs in respect of any lease or disposal

the Lead Councillor stated that the Council was the freehold owner of the Ripley toilets and was grateful to Ripley Parish Council for agreeing to pick up the running costs to enable them to remain open and felt that £15,000 was an appropriate amount to assist them in that regard. At the time the first iteration of the press release was issued, the agreement with Ripley had not been finalised. A second press release followed which did make reference to that agreement.

- (e) Councillor Guida Esteves asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the following question:

“With reference to the Item 8 on the Council Agenda, Approach to the Review and Potential Update to the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2019), I am disappointed with the proposed delay to the formal review. The current plan focuses development outside the town centre, making it more car dependent, does not adequately reflect the climate emergency declared by the Council, is dependent on infrastructure that will not be delivered and may no longer reflect the reality of retail and commerce needs post the COVID pandemic.

Paragraph 3.6 of the report to Council (page 32 of the Council agenda) recommends that it is appropriate to undertake any formal review of the LPSS towards the end of the 5 year period, i.e. before 25 April 2024, unless circumstances change in any significant way in terms of government guidance. The adopted local plan was made under NPPF 2012 which has since been updated in 2018, 2019, and most recently July 2021.

- a) *Given this, can the Leader please confirm what will constitute a significant change in government guidance that would trigger the review, given that three revisions of the NPPF appear not to qualify? and*
- b) *Can the Leader please also confirm what monitoring and mechanism is being put in place to ensure that the proposed approach is “revisited immediately”, as stated?”*

The Leader’s response was as follows:

“The Council has already begun the process of reviewing the LPSS. In accordance with LPSS Policy ID2, a review of the transport evidence base is already underway to understand the implications of the Government’s cancellation of the A3 Guildford scheme.

We also intend to shortly procure a range of evidence base documents including retail, leisure and employment needs studies to understand the changing context post COVID.

It is necessary to have the outputs of this work prior to a Formal Review and decision regarding whether or not the LPSS (or parts of it) need to be updated. It is hoped that by the time the Formal Review is undertaken there will also be clarity regarding the Government’s proposed changes to the planning system including any amendments to the Standard Method for calculating housing need.”

In response to a supplementary question enquiring as to when would be the latest that the formal review could be started, and what would trigger the formal review the Leader stated that this would be addressed in the next item on the agenda.

- (f) Councillor Ramsey Nagaty asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the question below. (Councillor Bigmore’s response to each element of the question is set out in **red type** below).

“May I ask the Leader of the Council:

- (i) *to confirm what conflicts of interest matters were taken into account before finalising the appointment of Ms Cook?*

“There are no conflicts of interest. Thorough checks and declarations were made about avoiding any potential conflicts of interest and Mary Cook, as a barrister and partner in a firm of solicitors, is aware of the requirements and complied fully with them”.

- (ii) *Ms Cook's advice only takes into account the impact of the Standard Methodology which would need to be used. What reason does the Council give for not taking into account any other part of the calculation of the housing number?*

"It is for Ms Cook to respond to the brief how she sees fit. Members were provided with the opportunity to ask questions of Ms Cook in relation to her advice at a briefing session. Ms Cook's advice states that local housing need should be assessed using the standard method unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach. However, she goes on to raise concerns regarding whether Guildford would be successful in demonstrating an alternative approach on the basis of her knowledge and experience".

- (v) *Why is the motion on this Order Paper in respect of Agenda Item 8 so reliant on one opinion and does not take into account wider aspects such as Climate Change, maintaining food security, already high level of housing above the plan figure etc?"*

"The Council motion called for independent advice to be sought regarding the review process. It is for the author to decide what issues to take into account in answering the brief".

In response to a supplementary question enquiring as to:

- (i) why, given that Mary Cook acted primarily for developers, the Council did not approach the likes of Client Earth for the advice;
- (ii) why the Council could not claim that high levels of AONB or Greenbelt can represent exceptional circumstances to justify an adjustment to the standard method; and
- (iii) why the advice did not address the wider issues of climate change, biodiversity, food security, lack of infrastructure, and the failure of brownfield first

the Leader stated that Mary Cook had openly indicated that her firm acted for the landowner developer at Garlicks Arch in negotiating the section 106 agreement and was also acting for Native Land. However, since the proposal upon which advice was sought involved a Development Management local plan, he was satisfied that there were no conflicts of interest. The Leader also stated that the question of whether there were special circumstances was a matter for an examiner to determine, not the Council. In relation to climate change, brownfield first, and food security, the Leader agreed that there was nothing in national planning policy that was up to date with the needs of the people or the wants of Guildford Borough residents.

In response to a further question as to whether he had been able to identify any brownfield sites that had not been reviewed within the local plan process, the Leader referred to the Town Centre Masterplan that was designed to unlock brownfield sites but did not have the detail to hand about any sites that may or may not have been included in the formation of the Local Plan Strategy and Sites 2019, but the Leader confirmed that the administration was focused on unlocking sites that may have previously been locked.

CO113 APPROACH TO THE REVIEW AND POTENTIAL UPDATE TO THE LOCAL PLAN: STRATEGY AND SITES (2019)

The Council considered a report which outlined the Council's approach to the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2019 (LPSS) review and potential update process in light of the expert independent legal opinion that had recently been provided by Mary Cook. The report had concluded that in line with the external advice provided and given the high degree of uncertainty, including in relation to the government's intended changes to the way in which housing need was to be calculated and to the plan making system as a whole, it was

considered prudent to not undertake an early Formal Review of the LPSS but instead carry out the Formal Review towards the end of the statutory 5-year period within which the plan must be formally reviewed.

The report had also confirmed ongoing work in progressing and adopting the emerging Local Plan: Development Management Policies (LPDMP) and progressing a Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). These documents would play a vital role in securing good quality development within the borough over the plan period. It also noted the ongoing work to support the Shaping Guildford's Future programme and its evidence base, including for this work to inform the preparation of a formal planning document.

Before proceeding to the debate, the Council

RESOLVED: That a recorded vote be taken in respect of each paragraph of the motion.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore proposed, and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, seconded the adoption of the following motion:

- “(1) That the Council notes the independent expert legal advice of a potential Local Plan Review at Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council.
- (2) That the Council endorses the approach proposed to not conclude a Formal Review of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) at this stage but instead undertake it towards the end of the statutory five-year period unless circumstances change in such a way that means that undertaking an earlier review would be advantageous to the Council.
- (3) That the Executive be updated on the outcomes of the review of the transport evidence base currently underway and any other significant changes in circumstance that may impact on considerations regarding the timing of the Formal Review of the LPSS.
- (4) That priority be given to the production of a Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document alongside the emerging Local Plan: Development Management Policies.

Reason:

To update Council on progress on the Council resolution [see minute CO102] which was agreed on 13 April 2021”.

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Bigmore 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:

- (a) Substitute “Borough” in place of “Council” at the end of paragraph (2)
- (b) Substitute “Full Council” in place of “Executive” in paragraph (3)

The motion, as altered, would read as follows:

- “(1) That the Council notes the independent expert legal advice of a potential Local Plan Review at Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council.
- (2) That the Council endorses the approach proposed to not conclude a Formal Review of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) at this stage but instead undertake it towards the end of the statutory five-year period unless circumstances change in such a way that means that undertaking an earlier review would be advantageous to the Borough.
- (3) That the Full Council be updated on the outcomes of the review of the transport evidence base currently underway and any other significant changes in circumstance

that may impact on considerations regarding the timing of the Formal Review of the LPSS.

- (4) That priority be given to the production of a Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document alongside the emerging Local Plan: Development Management Policies”.

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.

During the debate, the following points were raised by councillors:

- the adverse impact of the Local Plan on the green belt and villages
- across the country, councils had been challenging the housing numbers that had been set; powerful analysis had shown that the numbers had been distorted in university towns like Guildford because of incorrect assumptions about students staying after graduation
- Mark Cook’s advice had provided no coherent analysis just assertion that it was not possible to put the inset villages back in the green belt and that reviewing the housing number would result in a higher number
- Delaying the review would open Guildford to a much greater risk than the standard method; the standard method could be adjusted as Guildford had exceptional circumstances with 44% of land with AONB, 89% greenbelt, with air quality issues. The University had 40% overseas students which distorted the housing figure as the ONS had confirmed in writing. With the population on the decline, the housing numbers for Guildford were too high and should be adjusted down using local substantiated reasons and constraints.
- The transport infrastructure had not been forthcoming as hoped in the Local Plan and was questionable at the time in ignoring the impact on the local road network.
- Despite a climate emergency, strategic sites and infills in the villages and green fields were car-dependent with no measures in place to mitigate the effects of climate change and harm to biodiversity
- Query whether a review using the standard method would actually result in a higher housing figure than the current Local Plan figure.
- It was for the Council to decide what were exceptional circumstances and to provide robust evidence in support, and for the inspector to challenge it
- The impact of the Local Plan had already caused harm to the character and heritage of villages like West Horsley, with no infrastructure being delivered to mitigate that impact, which was why the formal review of the Local Plan could not be delayed.
- In the absence of an approved town centre master plan policy housebuilding was not happening on brownfield land where it was really needed
- The uncertainty of government direction on housebuilding cannot be used as a reason for delay in reviewing and updating the Local Plan. The Council needed to be proactive in taking forward the review now.
- Failure to review the Local Plan now would mean that there would be other mechanisms not addressed in Mary Cook's advice which would lead to potential presumptions in favour of development which the Council would be unable to resist
- There was no discussion in the report as to how the housing delivery number calculation was going to be prepared
- The Council needed to be realistic about the chances of success in proceeding with a formal review of the local plan at this stage, given the clear and decisive legal advice given by Mary Cook, in particular that the housing requirement was higher in our administrative area than the current Local Plan requirement, that the exceptional local circumstances did not exist and that any attempt to review the housing requirement figure would result in a higher figure

- Whilst the legal advice was unpalatable for many councillors, it must be accepted as being impartial
- Support for the proposed Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document
- If the Council were to review and update the Local Plan now, there would be a huge risk that even more green belt would be lost.
- We not only need a review of the Local Plan but also a review of the traffic implications for the borough that are building up week by week month by month decision by decision
- The national planning system was not fit for purpose as it delivered housing targets which had very little relation to the facts on the ground or to population needs or to local needs and made no proper provision for infrastructure. The legal advice had confirmed that unless the formula for calculating housing numbers was changed, undertaking a review now would only result in a higher housing target being imposed. Similarly, that advice had confirmed that greenbelt sites, once removed from the greenbelt, could not be put back unless there were exceptional circumstances which did not exist.
- There was no evidence that this, or any other, Council could challenge the law in relation to the standard method of assessment especially with regard to the 2021 revision to the NPPF. All councils were suffering from inadequate infrastructure, pollution, and other failings as housing numbers were imposed by government.
- The Council must do all it can to protect the green belt and villages against further incursions from future plans and Mary Cook had advised that the Council needed better character studies for the villages and rural areas, and better design guidance.
- If the Local Plan was reviewed now rather than in two years' time the total number of additional homes required might only be in the order of 220 to 440 per annum; there is no insurance in the report that housing numbers were likely to reduce if the plan was reviewed later although there is also a risk that the housing numbers might actually be increased in two years' time resulting in the loss of further greenbelt.
- An early review of the Local Plan was necessary in order to breathe new life into Guildford town centre.
- The current Local Plan already had a higher housing number than the standard method would generate
- Paragraph (2) of the motion, as altered, was vague in terms of how the Council would actually take this forward and there was no clarification as to what circumstances would need to change to enable a review to be triggered
- Delaying a review of the plan would be unpopular but doing it earlier would be reckless risking a requirement to build more homes not fewer and putting more pressure on Green Belt not less.

Having given careful consideration to the matter, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Council notes the independent expert legal advice of a potential Local Plan Review at Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council.

Result of the Recorded Vote:

Paragraph (1) of the motion, as altered, was approved, with thirty-four councillors voting in favour, none voting against, and eight abstentions, as follows:

FOR:

Councillor Tim Anderson
Councillor Jon Askew
Councillor Joss Bigmore
Councillor David Bilbé

AGAINST:

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Paul Abbey
Councillor Guida Esteves
Councillor Angela Gunning
Councillor Diana Jones

FOR:

Councillor Chris Blow
 The Deputy Mayor,
 Councillor Dennis Booth
 Councillor Ruth Brothwell
 Councillor Colin Cross
 Councillor Graham Eyre
 Councillor Andrew Gomm
 Councillor Angela Goodwin
 Councillor David Goodwin
 Councillor Gillian Harwood
 Councillor Jan Harwood
 Councillor Tom Hunt
 Councillor Nigel Manning
 Councillor Ted Mayne
 Councillor Julia McShane
 Councillor Bob McShee
 Councillor Masuk Miah
 Councillor George Potter
 Councillor Jo Randall
 Councillor John Redpath
 Councillor Maddy Redpath
 Councillor John Rigg
 Councillor Tony Rooth
 Councillor Will Salmon
 Councillor Deborah Seabrook
 Councillor Pauline Searle
 Councillor Paul Spooner
 Councillor James Steel
 Councillor James Walsh
 Councillor Fiona White
 Councillor Keith Witham

AGAINST:**ABSTAIN:**

The Mayor, Councillor
 Marsha Moseley
 Councillor Ramsey Nagaty
 Councillor Susan Parker
 Councillor Catherine Young

- (2) That the Council endorses the approach proposed to not conclude a Formal Review of the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (LPSS) at this stage but instead undertake it towards the end of the statutory five-year period unless circumstances change in such a way that means that undertaking an earlier review would be advantageous to the Borough.

Result of the Recorded Vote:

Paragraph (2) of the motion, as altered, was approved, with twenty-three councillors voting in favour, fourteen voting against, and five abstentions, as follows:

FOR:

Councillor Jon Askew
 Councillor Joss Bigmore
 Councillor Chris Blow
 Councillor Ruth Brothwell
 Councillor Angela Goodwin
 Councillor David Goodwin
 Councillor Gillian Harwood
 Councillor Tom Hunt
 Councillor Diana Jones
 Councillor Ted Mayne
 Councillor Julia McShane
 Councillor Bob McShee
 Councillor Masuk Miah

AGAINST:

Councillor Tim Anderson
 Councillor David Bilbé
 Councillor Colin Cross
 Councillor Guida Esteves
 Councillor Graham Eyre
 Councillor Angela Gunning
 Councillor Jan Harwood
 Councillor Nigel Manning
 Councillor Ramsey Nagaty
 Councillor Susan Parker
 Councillor John Redpath
 Councillor Paul Spooner
 Councillor Keith Witham

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Paul Abbey
 The Deputy Mayor,
 Councillor Dennis Booth
 Councillor Andrew Gomm
 The Mayor, Councillor
 Marsha Moseley
 Councillor Jo Randall

FOR:

Councillor George Potter
 Councillor Maddy Redpath
 Councillor John Rigg
 Councillor Tony Rooth
 Councillor Will Salmon
 Councillor Deborah Seabrook
 Councillor Pauline Searle
 Councillor James Steel
 Councillor James Walsh
 Councillor Fiona White

AGAINST:

Councillor Catherine Young

ABSTAIN:

- (3) That the Full Council be updated on the outcomes of the review of the transport evidence base currently underway and any other significant changes in circumstance that may impact on considerations regarding the timing of the Formal Review of the LPSS.

Result of the Recorded Vote:

Paragraph (3) of the motion, as altered, was approved, with forty councillors voting in favour, none voting against, and two abstentions, as follows:

FOR:

Councillor Tim Anderson
 Councillor Jon Askew
 Councillor Joss Bigmore
 Councillor David Bilbé
 Councillor Chris Blow
 The Deputy Mayor,
 Councillor Dennis Booth
 Councillor Ruth Brothwell
 Councillor Colin Cross
 Councillor Guida Esteves
 Councillor Graham Eyre
 Councillor Andrew Gomm
 Councillor Angela Goodwin
 Councillor David Goodwin
 Councillor Angela Gunning
 Councillor Gillian Harwood
 Councillor Jan Harwood
 Councillor Tom Hunt
 Councillor Diana Jones
 Councillor Nigel Manning
 Councillor Ted Mayne
 Councillor Julia McShane
 Councillor Bob McShee
 Councillor Masuk Miah
 Councillor Ramsey Nagaty
 Councillor Susan Parker
 Councillor George Potter
 Councillor Jo Randall
 Councillor John Redpath
 Councillor Maddy Redpath
 Councillor John Rigg
 Councillor Tony Rooth
 Councillor Will Salmon
 Councillor Deborah Seabrook
 Councillor Pauline Searle

AGAINST:**ABSTAIN:**

Councillor Paul Abbey
 The Mayor, Councillor
 Marsha Moseley

FOR:

Councillor Paul Spooner
 Councillor James Steel
 Councillor James Walsh
 Councillor Fiona White
 Councillor Keith Witham
 Councillor Catherine Young

AGAINST:**ABSTAIN:**

- (4) That priority be given to the production of a Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document alongside the emerging Local Plan: Development Management Policies.

Result of the Recorded Vote:

Paragraph (4) of the motion, as altered, was approved, with thirty-two councillors voting in favour, eight voting against, and two abstentions, as follows:

FOR:

Councillor Tim Anderson
 Councillor Jon Askew
 Councillor Joss Bigmore
 Councillor Chris Blow
 The Deputy Mayor,
 Councillor Dennis Booth
 Councillor Ruth Brothwell
 Councillor Colin Cross
 Councillor Guida Esteves
 Councillor Angela Goodwin
 Councillor David Goodwin
 Councillor Angela Gunning
 Councillor Gillian Harwood
 Councillor Tom Hunt
 Councillor Diana Jones
 Councillor Ted Mayne
 Councillor Julia McShane
 Councillor Bob McShee
 Councillor Masuk Miah
 Councillor Ramsey Nagaty
 Councillor Susan Parker
 Councillor George Potter
 Councillor John Redpath
 Councillor Maddy Redpath
 Councillor John Rigg
 Councillor Tony Rooth
 Councillor Will Salmon
 Councillor Deborah Seabrook
 Councillor Pauline Searle
 Councillor James Steel
 Councillor James Walsh
 Councillor Fiona White
 Councillor Catherine Young

AGAINST:

Councillor David Bilbé
 Councillor Graham Eyre
 Councillor Andrew Gomm
 Councillor Jan Harwood
 Councillor Nigel Manning
 Councillor Jo Randall
 Councillor Paul Spooner
 Councillor Keith Witham

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Paul Abbey
 The Mayor, Councillor
 Marsha Moseley

CO114 LOCAL GOVERNMENT COLLABORATION - APPROVAL OF INTER-AUTHORITY AGREEMENT AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

At full Council meetings of both Guildford and Waverley in July last year, both councils had agreed to greater partnership working including the creation of a Joint Chief Executive and a

single management team as a first step towards recommending business cases for further collaboration, on a service-by-service basis.

In a Vision Statement drawn up by the Executives of both councils and presented to those meetings, collaboration was seen as being driven by more than the serious financial challenges that face all councils. There was an ambition to “protect, improve, and expand discretionary services, and explore new services”. The Executives wished to enhance both councils’ ambitions for carbon neutrality, “use the best of both councils” and “protect/create local jobs”. Their stated focus was on “better outcomes for residents and communities” that might arise from collaboration, potentially “go[ing] beyond shared management and shared services and be[ing] strategic in intent ... to secure a longer-term sustainable future”. Specific savings targets were then included in both councils’ Budgets and Medium-Term Financial Plans.

The councils agreed to establish a Joint Appointments Committee to conduct the recruitment and selection process in respect of the proposed Joint Chief Executive and the single management team. In November 2021, both councils formally appointed Tom Horwood as the Joint Chief Executive and he commenced in this role in December.

It was agreed that an important early step in the partnership would be for both councils to approve Heads of Terms of an Inter-Authority Agreement (IAA), which would set out the formal governance arrangements for joint working, including cost and risk-sharing, dispute resolution and exit clauses.

A joint working group of six councillors (three from each council) was established in January 2022, which had met regularly to discuss the themes for inclusion in the Heads of Terms, together with a Risk Assessment in relation to key aspects of the collaboration.

The joint working group had completed its work and officers had drafted the Heads of Terms for approval by both Councils in April, which were appended to the report now before the Council for approval.

A copy of the collaboration Risk Assessment recommended by the joint working group was also attached to the report.

One of the discussion themes considered by the joint working group was to examine possible models of governance for managing the collaboration in the future. The joint working group had recommended that the existing Joint Appointments Committee should be retained with another joint committee being established to consider other governance related issues including the review of both the IAA and the Risk Assessment, recognising that, as the collaboration progressed, a greater degree of formal joint governance arrangements might be required. The joint working group had recommended, for adoption by both councils, the creation of a new Joint Governance Committee and draft terms of reference, which were attached to the report.

Following approval of the Heads of Terms by both councils, the Joint Chief Executive would commence the formal process for the appointment of the Joint Management Team.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by Councillor George Potter, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the draft Heads of Terms of the Inter-Authority Agreement setting out the formal governance arrangements for joint working between Guildford and Waverley, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

- (2) That the Monitoring Officer be authorised to enter into the final Inter-Authority Agreement on behalf of Guildford Borough Council.
- (3) That the collaboration Risk Assessment, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, be approved.
- (4) That the establishment of a Joint Governance Committee and its proposed composition and terms of reference, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report, be approved.
- (5) That the Joint Governance Committee be authorised to approve its standing orders at its first meeting.
- (6) That, subject to approval of paragraph (4) above, Guildford's numerical allocation of seats to the political groups on the proposed Joint Governance Committee shall be as follows:
 - Residents for Guildford and Villages: two seats
 - Guildford Liberal Democrats: two seats
 - Conservatives: one seat
 - Guildford Greenbelt Group: one seat
- (7) That the nominations for membership and substitute membership of the Joint Governance Committee for the 2022-23 municipal year, be considered at the Selection Council meeting on 16 May 2022.
- (8) That the Monitoring Officer be authorised to amend the constitution to incorporate the establishment of the Joint Governance Committee, and its terms of reference; and, subject to paragraph (5) above, its standing orders.

Reason:

To approve the governance processes required to progress the collaboration with Waverley Borough Council.

CO115 WEST CLANDON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

The Council noted that neighbourhood plans were development plans produced by parish/town councils or neighbourhood forums. West Clandon Parish Council had produced the West Clandon Neighbourhood Plan ("the Plan") covering the West Clandon Neighbourhood Area (West Clandon Parish).

To meet the requirements of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ("the Regulations"), the Council held a six-week consultation and arranged for an examination of the Plan. The Plan was then amended in line with the examiner's recommendations and was the subject of a referendum of qualifying voters within the neighbourhood area on 17 March 2022.

In response to the referendum question "Do you want Guildford Borough Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for the West Clandon Neighbourhood Area to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?", the majority of voters in the referendum voted 'Yes'. The vote was 313 for and 20 against, with a turnout of 30.1%.

By virtue of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the Act") and the Regulations, the Council must 'make' (adopt) the Plan as soon as reasonably practicable after the referendum is held and, in any event, not later than the last day of the period of 8 weeks from the day after the referendum. The Council did not need to make a neighbourhood plan if it considered that the making of it would be a breach, or would otherwise be incompatible with, any retained EU obligations (as incorporated into UK law) or human rights obligations. Officers

were of the view that making the Plan would not breach these obligations. The Council must therefore decide whether or not to make the Plan.

As a result of amendments to The Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 (Commencement No. 1) Regulations 2017, neighbourhood plans now formed part of the statutory Development Plan and carried full weight in planning decisions as soon as they were approved at a referendum, rather than when they are made by the Council at the final stage of the process. Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Resources, Councillor Tim Anderson, the Council

RESOLVED: To 'make' (adopt) the West Clandon Neighbourhood Plan.

Reason:

To meet the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

CO116 PRE-ELECTION PUBLICITY GUIDANCE

Councillors noted that the Pre-Election Period was the period prior to an election from the date of the notice of the election to the close of polls on polling day. There were statutory restrictions that applied to council publicity during the Pre-Election Period.

The Pre-Election Period Publicity Policy sought to ensure that the Council acted lawfully in relation to the use of Council resources in the lead up to an election, to provide guidance to Councillors and Officers and to limit Council and Committee meetings and other decision-making which took place during the Pre-Election Period to those which were strictly necessary and business as usual.

At its meeting held on 22 March 2022, the Executive had considered this matter and endorsed the recommendation to adopt the Policy.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, the Council

RESOLVED: That the Pre-Election Period Publicity Policy, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved with immediate effect.

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.

CO117 COUNCILLOR CHRIS BLOW

As Councillor Blow was in attendance, the Council agreed to withdraw this item.

CO118 DIRECTORS' PAY AWARD 2022

The Council was reminded that the pay award for all staff in the salary bands below Director level was agreed each year by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council. Separate approval from full Council was required for this pay award to be applied to the Director posts.

The Council noted that the pay award for the Joint Chief Executive was determined by the Joint Appointments Committee.

Councillors noted that the report on this matter had also been considered by the Employment Committee at its meeting on 25 March 2022. The Committee had endorsed the recommendation to approve the pay award.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Julia McShane, the Council

RESOLVED: That a pay award of 3.75% be approved for the Director posts with effect from 1 April 2022 in accordance with the Council's adopted Pay Policy Statement, following last year's pay freeze.

Reason:

To apply a pay award to the Director posts that is in line with the general staff pay award for 2022-23, following last year's pay freeze and noting the current higher rate of cost-of-living inflation.

CO119 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 25 January and 24 February 2022.

CO120 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 24 MARCH 2022: SURREY POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Paul Spooner proposed, and Councillor Keith Witham seconded, the following motion:

"In recent weeks, a sub-committee of the Surrey Police and Crime Panel, which is majority male, voted to discipline the Police and Crime Commissioner for supporting the view that biologically male rapists were not female.

This is a disgraceful decision by the sub-committee which has caused anger and hurt for women in Surrey, as it sets a precedent that men should police the language of women about an emotive subject.

This Council condemns the decision made by the Surrey Police and Crime Panel sub-committee and calls on the Joint Chief Executive of this Council to send a letter of concern to the Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel".

Following the debate on the motion, the Council

RESOLVED: That the motion be not supported.

CO121 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 25 MARCH 2022: ENDING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor George Potter proposed, and Councillor Pauline Searle seconded, the following motion:

"Council notes that:

- i. Sexual violence, sexual harassment, and domestic abuse remain endemic in our society:

- a. In 2019/20, 4.9 million women were victims of sexual assault in England and Wales, according to the Office for National Statistics (ONS).
 - b. A third of 16-18-year-old girls report experiencing unwanted sexual touching at school, according to End Violence Against Women.
- ii. The pandemic has made the situation worse:
 - a. The ONS report into Domestic abuse during the pandemic in November 2020 found increased demand for victim services and indicators that severity of abuse has increased.
 - b. Plan International UK found that since lockdown began, 1 in 5 girls aged 14-21 experienced public sexual harassment.
 - c. By 2030, 2 million more girls are now at risk of undergoing Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) due to the pandemic according to Plan International.
- iii. The justice system is failing many victims of domestic abuse and sexual violence:
 - a. Out of 139,000 rapes estimated by the ONS in the year ending March 2020, only 58,845 were reported to police. Of those, just 2.4% ended in convictions.
 - b. Three in four domestic abuse cases in England and Wales end without charge, according to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services.
- iv. Those from minority backgrounds experience domestic abuse disproportionately:
 - a. ONS figures for 2019 show that disabled women were more than twice as likely to experience domestic abuse than non-disabled women.
 - b. LGBT+ people are significantly more likely to experience domestic abuse, with 13 per cent of bisexual women facing intimate partner abuse in 2019/20, according to Stonewall.
 - c. In 2019, 60 per cent of UK police forces admitted referring victims of crime to the Home Office for immigration purposes, harming migrant women.
- v. The Domestic Abuse Act 2021, whilst very welcome, still contains policy gaps, including failure to provide equal protection for migrant women.
- vi. The funding for domestic abuse services in the 2021 Budget falls short of the figure that Women's Aid says is needed by over £200 million per year.
- vii. The UK has failed to ratify the Istanbul Convention, a treaty creating a global framework for protecting women from violence.

Council believes that:

- I. Everyone, regardless of identity, has the right to live a life free from fear and violence.
- II. Current systems and services do not properly tackle continuing violence against women and girls in our society due to underfunding, ingrained culture of victim blaming and lack of available education and training.
- III. Investing in raising awareness, education, and policies aimed at prevention is vital and prevents greater costs long-term.
- IV. An intersectional approach to violence against women and girls is imperative to provide high level care and support to the most vulnerable victims.
- V. Disclosures of abuse must be made easier and always taken seriously by authorities who offer a trauma-informed response.
- VI. Perpetrators of serious violence usually have a history of inflicting abuse and harassment against other women and girls. Tackling violence against women and girls means dismantling this culture.
- VII. Ending violence against women and girls must be a top priority for all levels of government.

Council resolves:

That the Executive be requested to:

- A. recognise misogyny as a hate crime.
- B. find ways to help support members of our diverse communities who may need specialist care and help.
- C. ensure that Guildford Borough Council continues to do everything in its power to build a borough free from misogyny and violence against women and girls. This includes continuing to invest in vital services, listening and responding to women and girls about the action needed, and calling out misogyny and sexism wherever we see or hear it.
- D. work with Surrey Police on improving women's safety in Guildford borough.
- E. continue to work with local and national networks working to end violence against women and girls
- F. become a White Ribbon Accredited Organisation <https://www.whiteribbon.org.uk/organisations>

Council calls on Surrey Police to:

- a. record harassment of women and girls as a hate crime as soon as possible, not wait until they are required to do so
- b. prioritise investigating crimes against women and girls and ask them to ensure that women and girls are treated with the required sensitivity.

Council calls on Surrey County Council to:

- a. encourage the teaching of age-appropriate education on consent from primary school.
- b. work with schools and families to tackle toxic masculinity culture, and to educate men through campaigns and bringing in male "allies".

Council calls on the Government to:

1. Increase efforts to prevent and detect violence against women and girls by:
 - a. Funding an NHS-style public awareness campaign as soon as possible, including on long-lasting trauma impacts.
 - b. Consulting education leaders and the specialist violence against women and girls sector, to take immediate action on sexual harassment in schools and higher education.
 - c. Implementing guidance to include awareness of public sexual harassment and its consequences in the national curriculum.
 - d. Upskilling all school staff via training to ensure confidence in correctly and sensitively handling disclosures of a sexual or abusive nature.
 - e. Introducing a duty on public authorities to ensure all frontline staff are trained to detect and respond appropriately to domestic abuse.
 - f. Improving cross-government coordination of policies and services for separating families across England and Wales.
 - g. Establishing a plan to tackle the social recovery of vulnerable and at-risk women and girls following the pandemic.
 - h. Ensuring the child's safety and needs are put first when decisions are made as to the appropriate level of contact with an abusive parent.
2. Improve outcomes for victims of sexual violence and domestic abuse by:
 - a. Ensuring migrant women have equal access to protection from abuse.
 - b. Introducing training and guidance for organisations on making their services more trans inclusive.

- c. Offering a long-term funding model for specialist services, including specialist BAME and LGBT+ services, so they can plan strategically and fully focus on providing support.
 - d. Introducing mandatory training for police and the Crown Prosecution Service in understanding the impact of trauma on victims.
 - e. Improving access to independent legal support for victims, including those with no recourse to public funds.
 - f. Introducing mandatory awareness training for local authority Children's Services staff to enable them to appropriately examine and record allegations of domestic abuse which may present as parental conflict.
 - g. Ensuring appropriate support is available for those who do not flee from their abuser.
 - h. Giving Local Authorities the duty and funding to provide appropriate accommodation and support for survivors of abuse
3. Strengthen the justice system to properly deal with sexual violence and domestic abuse by:
- a. Urgently increasing funding to reduce Criminal and Family court backlogs.
 - b. Extending protections of 16 and 17-year-olds by expanding the definition of 'position of trust', to include all adults who work/volunteer with under-18s.
 - c. Legislating to make public sexual harassment a criminal offence.
 - d. Legislating to make the promotion of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) a hate crime.
4. Establish the UK as a leader in domestic and global efforts to end violence against women and girls by:
- a. Ratifying the Istanbul Convention as soon as possible.
 - b. Setting up an independent commission on 'Ending Violence Against Women and Girls' for ongoing, sustainable accountability and progress in domestic and global efforts."

Under Council Procedure Rule 15 (o), Councillor Potter 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) Omit "*Council notes that:*" and paragraphs i to vii which follow.

(2) After "*That the Executive be requested to:*" substitute the following in place of paragraphs A to F:

- "A. Ensure that Guildford Borough Council continues to do everything in its power to build a borough free from misogyny and violence against women and girls. This includes continuing to invest in vital services, listening and responding to women and girls about the action needed, and calling out misogyny and sexism wherever we see or hear it.*
- B. Ensure the council continues to work with the South West Surrey Domestic Abuse Outreach Service, Surrey Police, members of the Safer Guildford Partnership and other organisations to address violence against women and girls in the borough and to support victims.*
- C. Work to become a White Ribbon Supporter Organisation and investigate the impact and cost-effectiveness of GBC becoming a White Ribbon Accredited Organisation <https://www.whiteribbon.org.uk/organisations>*
- D. Write to the Police, Surrey County Council and Government as follows:"*

(3) After “*Council calls on the Government to*”, insert the following as paragraph 1. and re-number subsequent paragraphs accordingly:

“1. *Recognise misogyny as a hate crime.*”

The motion, as altered, would read as follows:

“Council believes that:

- i. Everyone, regardless of identity, has the right to live a life free from fear and violence.
- ii. Current systems and services do not properly tackle continuing violence against women and girls in our society due to underfunding, ingrained culture of victim blaming and lack of available education and training.
- iii. Investing in raising awareness, education, and policies aimed at prevention is vital and prevents greater costs long-term.
- iv. An intersectional approach to violence against women and girls is imperative to provide high level care and support to the most vulnerable victims.
- v. Disclosures of abuse must be made easier and always taken seriously by authorities who offer a trauma-informed response.
- vi. Perpetrators of serious violence usually have a history of inflicting abuse and harassment against other women and girls. Tackling violence against women and girls means dismantling this culture.
- vii. Ending violence against women and girls must be a top priority for all levels of government.

Council resolves:

That the Executive be requested to:

- A. Ensure that Guildford Borough Council continues to do everything in its power to build a borough free from misogyny and violence against women and girls. This includes continuing to invest in vital services, listening and responding to women and girls about the action needed, and calling out misogyny and sexism wherever we see or hear it.
- B. Ensure the council continues to work with the South West Surrey Domestic Abuse Outreach Service, Surrey Police, members of the Safer Guildford Partnership and other organisations to address violence against women and girls in the borough and to support victims.
- C. Work to become a White Ribbon Supporter Organisation and investigate the impact and cost-effectiveness of GBC becoming a White Ribbon Accredited Organisation.
<https://www.whiteribbon.org.uk/organisations>
- D. Write to the Police, Surrey County Council and Government as follows:

Council calls on Surrey Police to:

- a. Record harassment of women and girls as a hate crime as soon as possible, not wait until they are required to do so
- b. Prioritise investigating crimes against women and girls and ask them to ensure that women and girls are treated with the required sensitivity.

Council calls on Surrey County Council to:

- a. Encourage the teaching of age-appropriate education on consent from primary school.
- b. Work with schools and families to tackle toxic masculinity culture, and to educate men through campaigns and bringing in male ‘allies’.

Council calls on the Government to:

1. Recognise misogyny as a hate crime.
2. Increase efforts to prevent and detect violence against women and girls by:
 - a. Funding an NHS-style public awareness campaign as soon as possible, including on long-lasting trauma impacts.
 - b. Consulting education leaders and the specialist violence against women and girls sector, to take immediate action on sexual harassment in schools and higher education.
 - c. Implementing guidance to include awareness of public sexual harassment and its consequences in the national curriculum.
 - d. Upskilling all school staff via training to ensure confidence in correctly and sensitively handling disclosures of a sexual or abusive nature.
 - e. Introducing a duty on public authorities to ensure all frontline staff are trained to detect and respond appropriately to domestic abuse.
 - f. Improving cross-government coordination of policies and services for separating families across England and Wales.
 - g. Establishing a plan to tackle the social recovery of vulnerable and at-risk women and girls following the pandemic.
 - h. Ensuring the child's safety and needs are put first when decisions are made as to the appropriate level of contact with an abusive parent.
3. Improve outcomes for victims of sexual violence and domestic abuse by:
 - a. Ensuring migrant women have equal access to protection from abuse.
 - b. Introducing training and guidance for organisations on making their services more trans inclusive.
 - c. Offering a long-term funding model for specialist services, including specialist BAME and LGBT+ services, so they can plan strategically and fully focus on providing support.
 - d. Introducing mandatory training for police and the Crown Prosecution Service in understanding the impact of trauma on victims.
 - e. Improving access to independent legal support for victims, including those with no recourse to public funds.
 - f. Introducing mandatory awareness training for local authority Children's Services staff to enable them to appropriately examine and record allegations of domestic abuse which may present as parental conflict.
 - g. Ensuring appropriate support is available for those who do not flee from their abuser.
 - h. Giving Local Authorities the duty and funding to provide appropriate accommodation and support for survivors of abuse
4. Strengthen the justice system to properly deal with sexual violence and domestic abuse by:
 - a. Urgently increasing funding to reduce Criminal and Family court backlogs.
 - b. Extending protections of 16 and 17-year-olds by expanding the definition of 'position of trust', to include all adults who work/volunteer with under-18s.
 - c. Legislating to make public sexual harassment a criminal offence.
 - d. Legislating to make the promotion of Female Genital Mutilation/Cutting (FGM/C) a hate crime.
5. Establish the UK as a leader in domestic and global efforts to end violence against women and girls by ratifying the Istanbul Convention as soon as possible and setting up an independent commission on 'Ending Violence Against Women and Girls' for ongoing, sustainable accountability and progress in domestic and global efforts".

Following the debate on the motion, as altered, the Council

RESOLVED: That the motion, as altered, be not supported.

CO122 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 10.32 pm

Signed

Mayor

Date