



www.guildford.gov.uk

Contact: Andrea Carr
Committee Services
01483 444058

30 July 2021

Dear Councillor

Your attendance is requested at a remote meeting of the **STRATEGY AND RESOURCES EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD** to be held on **MONDAY 9 AUGUST 2021 at 7:00 pm**. The meeting can be accessed remotely via Microsoft Teams.

If for any reason Councillors lose their wi-fi connectivity to the meeting and are unable to re-join using the link in the Outlook calendar invitation, please re-join using the telephone number 020 3855 4748. You will be prompted to input a conference ID: 792 769 826#

Yours faithfully

James Whiteman
Managing Director

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

Chairman: Councillor Ruth Brothwell
Vice-Chairman: Councillor Will Salmon

Councillor Jon Askew
Councillor Christopher Barrass
Councillor Richard Billington
Councillor Colin Cross
Councillor Graham Eyre

Councillor Angela Gunning
Councillor Diana Jones
Councillor Steven Lee
Councillor Masuk Miah
Councillor Catherine Young

Authorised Substitute Members:

Councillor Paul Abbey
Councillor David Bilbé
Councillor Chris Blow
Councillor Dennis Booth
Councillor Guida Esteves
Councillor Andrew Gomm
Councillor Angela Goodwin
Councillor Gillian Harwood
Councillor Liz Hogger
Councillor Nigel Manning
Councillor Ted Mayne
Councillor Ann McShee

Councillor Bob McShee
Councillor Marsha Moseley
Councillor Ramsey Nagaty
Councillor Susan Parker
Councillor Jo Randall
Councillor Tony Rooth
Councillor Paul Spooner
Councillor Cait Taylor
Councillor James Walsh
Councillor Fiona White
Councillor Keith Witham

QUORUM: 4

WEBCASTING NOTICE

This meeting will be recorded for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website in accordance with the Council's capacity in performing a task in the public interest and in line with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014. The whole of the meeting will be recorded, except where there are confidential or exempt items, and the footage will be on the website for six months.

If you have any queries regarding webcasting of meetings, please contact Committee Services.

Please contact us to request this document in an alternative format

THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

Vision – for the borough

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

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

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

Values for our residents

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

The information contained in the items on this agenda has been allowed into the public arena in a spirit of openness and transparency to gain broad input at an early stage. Some of the ideas and proposals placed before this Executive Advisory Board may be at the very earliest stage of consideration by the democratic decision-making processes of the Council and should not be considered, or commented on, as if they already represent either Council policy or its firm intentions on the issue under discussion.

The Executive Advisory Boards do not have any substantive decision-making powers and, as the name suggests, their purpose is to advise the Executive. The subject matter of the items on this agenda, therefore, is for discussion only at this stage and any recommendations are subject to further consideration or approval by the Executive, and are not necessarily in final form.

A G E N D A

ITEM NO.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

In accordance with the local Code of Conduct, a councillor is required to disclose at the meeting any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) that they may have in respect of any matter for consideration on this agenda. Any councillor with a DPI must not participate in any discussion or vote regarding that matter and they must withdraw from the meeting immediately before consideration of the matter.

If that DPI has not been registered, the councillor must notify the Monitoring Officer of the details of the DPI within 28 days of the date of the meeting.

Councillors are further invited to disclose any non-pecuniary interest which may be relevant to any matter on this agenda, in the interests of transparency, and to confirm that it will not affect their objectivity in relation to that matter.

3 MINUTES (Pages 5 - 12)

To confirm the minutes of the Executive Advisory Board meeting held on 14 June 2021.

4 PUBLIC SPACE PROTECTION ORDER (PSPO) (Pages 13 - 36)

5 HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORT SCHEMES CRITICAL TO LOCAL PLAN DELIVERY (Pages 37 - 56)

6 EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN (Pages 57 - 88)

7 EAB WORK PROGRAMME (Pages 89 - 92)

To consider and approve the EAB's draft work programme with reference to the Executive Forward Plan.

14 JUNE 2021

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

14 June 2021

- * Councillor Ruth Brothwell (Chairman)
- * Councillor Will Salmon (Vice-Chairman)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| * Councillor Jon Askew | * Councillor Diana Jones |
| * Councillor Christopher Barrass | * Councillor Steven Lee |
| Councillor Richard Billington | Councillor Masuk Miah |
| Councillor Graham Eyre | * Councillor Maddy Redpath |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | * Councillor Catherine Young |

* Present

Councillors Tim Anderson, Jan Harwood, Julia McShane, George Potter, John Redpath and John Rigg were also in attendance.

SR9 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Graham Eyre.

SR10 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT AND DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests.

SR11 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Executive Advisory Board held on 26 April 2021 were confirmed as a correct record, and would be signed by the Chairman at the earliest opportunity.

SR12 NET ZERO CARBON EMISSIONS TRAJECTORY REPORT

The Lead Councillor for Climate Change introduced a report by the Association for Public Service Excellence (APSE) Energy which was before the Board for consideration. APSE Energy was APSE's local authority energy collaboration arm and the report provided the findings of the carbon footprint calculations and trajectory towards the Council achieving net zero carbon by 2030, in accordance with the commitment in its Climate Emergency Declaration of 23 July 2019.

The report explained that the Council had been recording its carbon emissions since 2008/09, which was the baseline year utilised as a reference point to track performance. The trajectory baseline carbon footprint year was nominated as the financial year of 2019/20, which was the reference point on which to base current emissions and to forecast the pathway to net zero carbon. The carbon footprint was categorised into scopes, which covered:

- Scope 1 (direct) emissions from activities owned or controlled by the Council, such as those from combustion in council owned or controlled boilers, furnaces and vehicles.
- Scope 2 (indirect) emissions associated with purchased electricity, heat, steam and cooling as a consequence of the Council's energy use that occurred at sources that the Council did not own or control.
- Scope 3 (other indirect) emissions resulting from the Council's actions that occurred at sources the Council did not own or control and were not classed as Scope 2

14 JUNE 2021

emissions. These included business travel by means outside the Council's ownership or control, and disposing of the Council's own waste and purchased goods in the supply chain.

The carbon footprint from Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions within the Council's operations equated to 8,613 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e). It was estimated that a budget of £6.6million was required to reach net zero carbon by increasing energy efficiency in buildings, generating power and developing a tree planting scheme. £26.6million capital was required to upgrade the vehicle fleet to electric, largely due to the 43 refuse lorries. It was estimated that these initiatives would financially benefit the Council by £1.6million annually by 2030. It was predicted that there would be 3,407 tonnes of CO₂e from hard to reduce sources that would require offsetting through a solar farm and a tree planting scheme.

The Climate Change Officer gave a presentation in support of the report which outlined the following areas:

- Context
- Purpose and contents of the Trajectory Report
- Carbon footprint
- Net greenhouse gas emissions 2019-20 and emissions trend
- Emissions relative to previous years and change in scope emissions over time
- Energy consumption
- Recommendations for data gathering
- Pathway methodology
- Interventions for reducing gas and electricity usage
- Heat pumps
- Achieving net zero carbon
- Tree planting
- Linear decarbonisation trajectory
- Cumulative cost savings and forecast capital costs
- Next steps

The following points arose from related questions, comments and discussion:

1. In terms of procurement, carbon emissions were included in a miscellany category in related documentation. Procurement could be influenced to reduce carbon emissions by procurement managers stating in specifications the associated carbon credentials being sought with regard to the goods or services being purchased. This would assist with judging the awarding proportions in tenders. As this could be a complicated procedure for managers, work was being undertaken to facilitate the process.
2. It was confirmed that the Council would not be able to achieve its target of net zero carbon by 2030 without offsetting some carbon emissions. In the case of trees offsetting carbon emissions, each mature tree could store approximately 4 tonnes of CO₂e and this should be taken into account when trees were felled in the Council's estate. The removal of trees also adversely affected ecology and biodiversity, which were experiencing similar emergencies to the climate. As a large number of trees were required to effectively offset carbon, identifying a sufficiently large planting site locally was a challenge and locations further afield may be required, particularly as carbon emissions were trans-boundary. The amount of tree canopy cover had been suggested as a means to measure the number of trees locally, and a better understanding of the canopy cover in the Borough was sought with a view to increasing it. In order to measure the tree canopy in the Borough, it would be necessary to undertake a satellite survey and make a scientific calculation to estimate

14 JUNE 2021

the number of existing trees and their collective level of carbon sequestration. Although grassland and vegetation were often identified as suitable areas for tree planting, this was not necessarily the case as they, together with marshland, wetland and flood plains, sequestered carbon and provided key habitats supporting diverse eco-systems. It was necessary to plant the correct species of trees in the right habitats and manage them to ensure successful planting. The Woodland Trust had advised that, in addition to new planting, a large proportion of the funds provided for carbon sequestration was spent on managing woodland to protect valuable ancient trees. Sequestering carbon on the scale required would not involve tree planting in urban areas as large amounts of land would be required, beyond the already wooded nature of the Borough, and sourcing the necessary land locally would be a challenge. However, there may be planting opportunities in other parts of Surrey and the County Council was operating a trial to identify sites for putting aside for renewables and sequestering. Scotland was a popular site for offsetting schemes owing to the amount of open space and low density of population whilst other models looked abroad where costs were lower.

3. As the specific details, such as location and scope, relating to tree planting associated with new residential developments were unknown, the Climate Change Officer would liaise with planning colleagues in this regard.
4. Carbon sequestration was an ongoing net cost whilst other carbon reduction measures such as insulation represented an initial investment which would lead to revenue generating savings in time when the payback period had passed. There was a need for the Council to focus on utilising the energy it consumed in a more efficient and effective manner such as use of renewable resources for example photovoltaic panels, having a renewable energy contract, insulation, and improved management measures such as lighting controls. It would not be feasible to undertake retrofitting at the Millmead complex owing to the age, architecture and structures in place. Once the carbon hierarchy had been pursued, attention would turn to carbon sequestration to offset against difficult to tackle or non-cost effective areas.
5. It was suggested that placing a blanket Tree Preservation Order across the Council's entire wooded estate may assist to protect trees at risk as a result of developments. Although this was outside the remit of the Climate Change Officer, he indicated that he would be interested in discussing such matters further with the Parks and Countryside Leader who spent a significant amount of his time on protecting trees, presumably in urban areas where residents sought felling for reasons of light or interference.
6. The Council was aware that the Future Homes Standard 2025 would deliver highly energy efficient new homes that were zero-carbon ready without fossil fuel heating systems such as gas boilers. The Standard also applied to the replacement of gas boilers in existing homes, which would be discontinued from that date. However, this would have minimal impact on the Council's own asset trajectory. The Council was working with partners to improve understanding of the future of heating systems. Trials of replacing gas with hydrogen in existing systems were taking place and it was felt that air source heat pumps were the way forward for new properties although there would be infrastructure challenges in retrofitting them in older residential properties. As numerous residential developments were expected to be constructed in the near future, it was hoped that developers could be encouraged to install heat pumps in new homes built prior to the 2025 deadline. However, as much planning policy was set at a national level, the Council had limited scope to influence change other than by linking with neighbouring authorities to lobby the Government where current arrangements did not align with long term targets. The Climate Change Officer liaised with planning colleagues in such areas.

The EAB agreed that the following views should be taken forward:

14 JUNE 2021

- Further thought should be given to the weighting attached to climate and environmental issues in the Council's procurement policies.
- The adoption of a firmer stance towards the imposition of planning conditions seeking higher environmental standards in new homes should be considered.
- Collaboration between the Climate Change Officer and planning officers / groups concerning tree planting associated with new residential developments should be encouraged.
- Consideration should be given to introducing a Borough wide blanket Tree Preservation Order across the Council's entire wooded estate to protect trees.

SR13 CONTRIBUTING TO REVIEWS OF THE LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME

The Lead Councillor for Resources introduced a report which provided members of the EAB with information regarding the Local Council Tax Support (LCTS) Scheme to enable them to feedback views in respect of the Scheme. Officers would utilise this feedback to inform the annual review to create the 2022 Scheme in addition to the proposed separate fundamental review of future options.

Following a consultation press release in September 2020, councillors had indicated that the EAB should consider the 2022 Scheme and officers proposed in their annual report to the Executive on 24 November 2020 that this would occur in May or early June 2021 before any modelling or forecasting took place to allow the EAB to have input at an early stage.

The report and accompanying presentation provided the EAB with further information regarding the complexities and challenges of the current LCTS Scheme and its component parts, and recommended that councillors expressed their views in respect of key areas they would like officers to either leave untouched or look at in more detail.

In his introduction, the Lead Councillor commended the Revenues and Benefits Lead and her team for undertaking the challenging administration of the numerous Government grants designed to support businesses during the pandemic in addition to the team's core functions. However, the proposed fundamental review had been paused owing to Covid-19 and the resulting diversion of resources into related initiatives. Attention was drawn to the issues before the EAB for debate which included whether all residents should pay a contribution towards their Council Tax demand regardless of their personal circumstances.

The Revenues and Benefits Lead presented the report and expanded upon the review of the LCTS Scheme and the fundamental review. There was a statutory requirement to undertake an annual review of the LCTS Scheme, which had taken place each year since 2013 when the Scheme had been introduced, and the outcome of the current review would be considered by full Council in December 2021 for implementation on 1 April 2022. The fundamental review of the Scheme would be an in-depth area of work focusing on establishing whether there was an improved option to deliver the Scheme moving forward. This would include comparing Guildford's Scheme with those of other local authorities to identify best practice and it was anticipated that the outcome would be reported to a future meeting of the EAB, possibly in 2022, for consideration.

The current LCTS Scheme was based on the Council Tax Benefits Scheme which existed prior to 1 April 2013. Although 80% of local authorities had asked residents to pay a contribution to their Council Tax bill by 2018 irrespective of their circumstances, this Council continued to provide a 100% discount and 71% of the current working age claimants in the Borough were in receipt of the full discount.

Comparisons had been made to 2020 against the schemes of the other Surrey borough / district councils and some local authorities outside Surrey, which had revealed similarities

14 JUNE 2021

with differing details. In recent years local authorities had considered alternative models such as a band of discount scheme which placed applicants into different bands according to their income and / or circumstances and allocated a percentage discount accordingly. This approach was felt to be simpler to administer. The main challenges and risks facing this Council were whether to continue with a working age scheme based on the Council Tax Benefits Scheme which continued to be statutory for pension age claimants, or to move to a discount based working age scheme, separating the administrative costs of assessing the LCTS scheme and Housing Benefits, and the difficulties associated with modelling change and accessing data.

The presentation accompanying the report featured examples of different categories of claimants; modelling and forecasting challenges to achieve a balanced scheme that was simple, fair and affordable; and discussion prompts concerning areas to leave untouched and areas to look at in more detail.

The following points arose from related questions, comments and discussion:

- Although Universal Credit (UC) had not significantly influenced the Council's LCTS scheme, the basis of which had been formulated in 2012 and taken effect from April 2013 when UC was in its infancy, the Council had sought to mirror some changes the Government had made to UC. The fundamental review was being driven partly by the roll out of UC, which was electronically assessed each month and, as it was taken into account as an income to qualify under the LCTS scheme, this could result in some claimants having their Council Tax payments recalculated every month. It was felt that this was an area to leave untouched in order to avoid the onerous and time consuming need for monthly LCTS recalculations.
- The alternative model of a band of discount scheme being considered by other local authorities constituted a Council Tax discount rather than a benefit scheme. This approach, which could consist of numerous income bands linked to types of household, would form part of the fundamental review.
- In terms of designing an LCTS scheme that was simple, fair and affordable, the current scheme was not considered to be simple and it was questionable whether it would be affordable in the long term. However, the scheme could be deemed to be fair owing to its complexity that enabled it to be tailored to assist in all household circumstances. Whilst a simpler scheme was sought, this would need to be balanced against fairness and affordability with a view to achieving the best combination to meet local needs.
- As LCTS Scheme calculations could be complex, possibly involving conversions between weekly, monthly or annual payments, they were based on five decimal places in the interests of accuracy featuring one final rounding of the figures to determine the ultimate amount.
- Although the Council Tax Benefits Scheme and the local banded discount scheme constituted the two main underlying models upon which LCTS Schemes were based, there was the potential for up to 300 varying individual schemes across the country as every Council Tax collection authority had the ability to set its own scheme to reflect local circumstances.
- With regard to opportunities for joint working and alignment of LCTS Scheme processes with other local councils, particularly Waverley Borough Council, there were some existing common elements in Surrey schemes such as applying a 100% discount. Although past work had taken place with a view to agreeing a consistent scheme across Surrey whilst allowing for minor local variables, this had proved to be challenging. In the event that closer working with Waverley developed, it would be beneficial for the fundamental review to explore Waverley's scheme in detail to identify any potential for pursuing a partnership approach.

14 JUNE 2021

- There was no evidence, such as substantial complaints, to indicate that the LCTS Scheme was not meeting the needs of claimants / recipients. Whilst the LCTS Scheme process was complicated, this was also the case with other benefit schemes and it was anticipated that claimants in receipt of other benefits in addition to the LCTS Scheme were accustomed to such complexity and did not consider it grounds for complaint. There was a local Council Tax Hardship Fund which operated in parallel to the LCTS Scheme and people disadvantaged by the local scheme rules could apply for a hardship award, the eligibility for which was determined on the basis of assessment of applicants' personal income, expenditure and circumstances. The Hardship Fund was traditionally under spent each year and this undersubscription indicated that there was not a particular issue with the LCTS Scheme failing to meet residents' needs.

Having agreed that the main point to be fed back from the Board's discussion was that the calculation of Universal Credit under the LCTS Scheme should be an area to remain untouched in the interests of avoiding onerous and time consuming monthly recalculations, EAB members were invited to submit any further views directly to the Revenues and Benefits Lead, who was thanked for her report, presentation and work.

SR14 EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN

The Executive Forward Plan was noted.

SR15 EAB WORK PROGRAMME

In response to concerns expressed by some EAB members regarding progress with developing several Supplementary Planning Documents and reviewing the Local Plan, the Strategic Services Director advised that review work in respect of the Local Plan had commenced and officers were preparing a related business case and timetable which would be shared with councillors at the earliest opportunity.

In terms of future work programming, there were several project mandates coming forward which would be scheduled for consideration at future EAB meetings when further details were known. The Chairman undertook to give future work programming some further attention.

SR16 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

The EAB

RESOLVED

That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the consideration of the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act; namely, information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

Following the exclusion of the public and press, the Board moved to a second (Part 2) meeting to consider the following item which contained exempt information.

SR17 SAVINGS STRATEGY UPDATE PRESENTATION

The meeting received and considered a briefing note presented by the Resources Director in respect of the General Fund Savings Strategy as at May 2021 which provided the

14 JUNE 2021

background to the Savings Strategy, identified the associated workstreams and provided a progress update in respect of the workstreams.

The meeting finished at 9.21 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Strategy and Resources Executive Advisory Board Report

Ward(s) affected: Holy Trinity, Christchurch, Friary and St Nicolas, and potentially surrounding wards.

Report of Strategic Services Director

Author: Yasmine Makin

Tel: 01483 444070

Email: yasmine.makin@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Councillor Julia McShane

Tel: 01483 837736

Email: julia.mcshane@guildford.gov.uk

Date: Monday 9 August 2021

Public Spaces Protection Order Review

Executive Summary

This report provides the EAB the opportunity to examine the process followed in reviewing the current town centre Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) and invites the EAB to advise and comment on the adherence to and appropriateness of the process followed in relation to the statutory guidance and Council's obligations.

The report sets out the context of the Council's existing PSPOs, the legal framework and the statutory guidance relevant to the review of a PSPO. The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 introduced Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) as a tool for councils to address anti-social behaviour (ASB) in their areas. The legislation includes statutory requirements for councils to adhere to when reviewing, developing, and implementing PSPOs. The Local Government Association (LGA) has produced guidance for councils based on the legislation and statutory requirements.

The Council has used the guidance to inform its approach to reviewing the current town centre PSPO. This report sets out how the Council has approached the review and adhered to the statutory guidance.

The report provides a summary of the consultation undertaken in the process so far and closes by setting out the next steps to be progressed in the review. The key risks associated with this review and the mitigations are also considered at the end of the report.

Recommendation

That the Board considers the process followed so far and comments on the adherence to and the appropriateness of the process in relation to the statutory guidance and the Council's obligations.

Reason(s) for Recommendation:

As part of its advisory role to the Executive the EAB's comments and feedback are valuable to ensure the process of reviewing the current PSPO and considering a new one is robust and adheres to the statutory guidance, ensuring the most appropriate outcome of the review.

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

No

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide the EAB the opportunity to examine the process followed in reviewing the current town centre Public Space Protection Order (PSPO).
- 1.2 The report invites the EAB to advise and comment on the adherence to and appropriateness of the process followed in relation to the statutory guidance and Council's obligations.

Strategic Priorities

- 2.1 The review of the current PSPO and consideration of a new PSPO support the Council's vision of making the borough 'a desirable place to live, work and visit', by reducing anti-social behaviour. PSPOs address and reduce anti-social behaviour and the detrimental impact it causes, including to the most vulnerable people in our community.

Background

3.1 Public Space Protection Orders

- 3.1.1 PSPOs, introduced through the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, are one of a range of tools available to councils to address anti-social behaviour. Rather than targeting specific individuals or properties, PSPOs focus on the identified problem behaviour in a specific location.
- 3.1.2 PSPOs can last up to three years before councils are required to review them, at which point they may be removed, amended, or extended by up to a further three years. The length of a PSPO should reflect the need for a proportionate response to the problem and may only need to be one or two years to address very specific issues. There is no limit on the number of times a PSPO may be reviewed and renewed.
- 3.1.3 PSPOs can prohibit specified activities and/or require specific action, such as prohibiting consumption of alcohol or requiring the surrendering of alcohol when asked. PSPOs apply to defined public areas and the activities included must:
 - have had (or be likely to have) a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality,
 - be (or be likely to be) persistent or continuing in nature,
 - be (or be likely to be) unreasonable, and
 - justify the restrictions being imposed.

3.2 Safer Guildford Partnership

- 3.2.1 The Safer Guildford Partnership (SGP) is our local community safety partnership which brings together both statutory and non-statutory strategic partners, as required by the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 amended by the Police Reform Act 2002 and the Police and Justice Act 2006.

- 3.2.2 The role of the SGP is to facilitate information sharing, identify local priorities and coordinate a planned response to the prevention of crime, disorder, anti-social behaviour (ASB) and reoffending, at a borough level. The SGP Plan 2018-21 sets the framework for the SGP and is reviewed annually.
- 3.2.3 The SGP Annual Action Plan 2020-21 sets out the actions agreed to achieve the priorities of the SGP as identified in the wider Plan. A review of the current town centre PSPO with a view to considering the need for an additional PSPO is included as an action in the Action Plan for 2021.

3.3 Existing PSPOs

- 3.3.1 The Council currently has two PSPOs in place, including a borough wide PSPO relating to dog fouling and a town centre PSPO relating to alcohol consumption.
- 3.3.2 In October 2020 the Council extended the town centre PSPO by three years, with a commitment to carry out a full review to determine whether there is a case for a PSPO covering a wider range of behaviours and locations.
- 3.3.3 We began this review early in 2021 with a view to conclude in the autumn.

3.4 Statutory guidance

- 3.4.1 In addition to statutory guidance developed by the Home Office to accompany the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, the Local Government Association (LGA) produced guidance aimed at councils considering a new PSPO. The LGA guidance sets out the practical implementation of the statutory guidance. This guidance also sets out the circumstances in which PSPOs are, and are not, appropriate and the legal tests PSPOs must meet.
- 3.4.2 PSPOs will not be suitable in all circumstances and should not be used in the place of other, more proportionate methods of tackling ASB. These other methods should be considered before a PSPO is pursued. Where a PSPO is used it should accompany other tools and methods in a balanced anti-social behaviour approach.
- 3.4.3 The legislation sets out the framework councils must adhere to before an order is introduced, once it is implemented and where it is extended, varied, or discharged. This includes determining the scope, areas covered and impact of the PSPO, as well as how each of the restrictions meets the legal test.

Legal tests

- 3.4.4 There are strict legal tests PSPOs must meet including the criteria set out in this report at paragraph 3.1.3. Our Legal Services Team provide further scrutiny against the statutory guidance.
- 3.4.5 Proposed restrictions must focus on specific behaviours and be proportionate to the detrimental effect that the behaviour is causing or can cause, and be necessary to prevent it from continuing, occurring, or recurring¹.

¹ [Public spaces protection orders: guidance for councils \(local.gov.uk\)](https://www.local.gov.uk/public-spaces-protection-orders-guidance-for-councils)

3.5 Process so far

- 3.5.1 The process followed so far has been informed by the statutory and LGA guidance. This includes being evidence-based, carrying out public consultation, and actively considering alternative tools for tackling ASB. The following paragraphs set out the key aspects of the guidance documentation and how we have adhered to it during this process.

Focus Group

- 3.5.2 The guidance emphasises the need to work with partners and consult where beneficial, to establish a thorough understanding of the issues and to ensure any new PSPO will be supported by effective enforcement.
- 3.5.3 A focus group of relevant internal and external partners was set up in March 2021, to ensure the review is informed by relevant experience and expertise. The focus group meets at least monthly and includes representatives from Surrey Police, Experience Guildford, and the Council's Parks, Legal, Community Safety, and Compliance leads.

Data collection and analysis

- 3.5.4 The LGA guidance explains 'the most robust Orders will be supported by a solid evidence base and rationale, that sets out how the statutory criteria for each of the proposed restrictions have been met and demonstrates a direct link between the anti-social behaviour and the PSPO being proposed in response'².
- 3.5.5 Collating data and evidence is key to the process of reviewing the need for a PSPO as this will help us determine whether the legal tests are met. The LGA guidance describes collating information about the nature and impact of the ASB as 'core elements of the evidence gathering and consultation process'.
- 3.5.6 Data collected from a range of sources should inform decision making and will avoid challenge at a later stage. We have collected and analysed a range of data from various sources to get a full understanding the of the behaviours, locations and impacts of ASB in and around the town centre. The data we have gathered so far includes:
- Data extracted from Surrey Police's database (NICHE) on incidents of ASB recorded in the town centre, which has then been used to create a map showing the most common locations of the ASB
 - Data from the Business Crime Reduction Partnership showing the types of behaviours and their locations affecting businesses in the town centre
 - Reports from Surrey Police provided through the Joint Neighbourhood Survey for west Surrey, containing the results of quarterly perception surveys of residents, including on matters such as ASB. These reports have been considered where information is relevant to the PSPO

² [Public spaces protection orders: guidance for councils \(local.gov.uk\)](https://www.local.gov.uk/public-spaces-protection-orders-guidance-for-councils)

- Results of the Purple Flag perception survey that the Council carries out each year as part of the Purple Flag accreditation scheme. We have used the community safety related results of the Purple Flag perception surveys in 2018 and 2019, to inform our evidence-base
- Surveys of our stakeholders, residents and visitors to support and validate the data collected when assessing the case for the development and implementation of a PSPO

Consultation requirements

- 3.5.7 The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 requires a consultation process before an Order can be made. The guidance sets out the statutory partners the Council must consult. More information about how we have consulted so far is contained within paragraph four of this report.

Enforcement

- 3.5.8 Some behaviours potentially suitable for inclusion in a PSPO are already covered by other legislation and regulation, such as littering under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.
- 3.5.9 Realistic expectations and resourcing for enforcement for the duration of a PSPO are critical to its successful implementation. To achieve this, representatives from Surrey Police and the Council's Compliance Team continue to inform the development of the enforcement plan and its implementation, through the focus group.
- 3.5.10 Consideration has also been given to ensure any new or updated protocol or procedure is aligned to the Council's existing and future approaches and policies around enforcement.

3.6 Impact of Coronavirus (Covid-19)

- 3.6.1 Coronavirus (Covid-19) and the associated restrictions have had an impact on both the nature of, and people's perceptions of, ASB. This has been borne in mind throughout the review and consultation. We have:
- considered issues presented to the Joint Action Group (JAG) over a three-year period to support the evidence case,
 - explicitly focused on longer-term, persistent behaviours that existed before Coronavirus (Covid-19) through all consultation, and
 - collected data from all sources over a three-year period, where available.

3.7 Next Steps

- 3.7.1 The PSPO review project plan sets out the following steps to be progressed, in line with the statutory guidance:

- detailed analysis of the responses received through the public survey
- a full review of all the data and evidence provided to determine the behaviours and the suitability of a revised or additional PSPO

If there is a case for a revised or additional PSPO:

- its scope and restrictions will be developed in a draft Order, in consultation with key stakeholders and our Legal Services team
- the draft order will be shared with key stakeholders
- the draft order will be published on the Council's website (see 4.2.7 below)
- an equality impact assessment (EQIA) will consider any unintended consequences of the PSPO which may impact those protected under the Equality Act 2010

3.7.2 A final Order will be adopted through the Council's Executive.

3.7.3 As discussed earlier in this report, adoption of a PSPO is only part of the process. Effective implementation and enforcement are key to a successful PSPO which results in less ASB and therefore a reduction of its impact on residents and visitors. The SGP will monitor and report on the implementation of a revised or additional PSPO.

4. Consultations

Stakeholders

4.1.1 A range of stakeholders have been identified including residents, visitors, businesses, ward councillors, Surrey Police, Experience Guildford, internal Council teams and specialist charity organisations. Each stakeholder has been involved at the most appropriate time according to their role and involvement in the review.

Partner and public surveys

4.2.1 In order to scope the behaviours and locations that should be considered in a revised or additional PSPO we carried out a survey of partners in spring 2021. The questions asked can be found in *appendix one* of this report.

4.2.2 The issues and problem behaviours raised through the stakeholder survey were used as the basis for a public survey which ran for four weeks from 4th June to 2nd July 2021. The questions asked can be found in *appendix two* of this report.

4.2.3 In addition to meeting the statutory requirement to consult, the results of these surveys provide a more robust understanding of the ASB issues and, most importantly, the impact ASB has on residents and visitors.

Notification to relevant councils

4.2.4 The statutory guidance requires councils to notify the relevant county and parish councils when reviewing or developing a PSPO. Both have been informed of the Council's intentions.

Statutory partners

- 4.2.5 Statutory partners have been consulted including: the local chief of police, Surrey Police and Crime Commissioner, owners or occupiers of land within the affected area where reasonably practicable, and community representatives.

Lead and ward councillors

- 4.2.6 In January 2021, the lead councillor for Community Safety and the ward councillors for the current town centre PSPO were invited to attend a presentation setting out our intentions to review the current town centre PSPO. The presentation set out the role of the SGP and the process of reviewing a PSPO as described by the LGA. Further presentations to the relevant councillors will continue as the review develops, as and when appropriate.

Further consultation

- 4.2.7 If, after a thorough assessment of the evidence, a case for an additional PSPO is found, a proposal for a new Order will be developed in partnership with Surrey Police, relevant Council teams and organisations identified in the EQIA. A draft version of this Order will be published on the Council's website for two weeks for public comment.

5. Key Risks

- 5.1 PSPOs can be challenged including on the grounds that proper processes have not been followed as prescribed by the legislation. To mitigate this risk, we have adhered to the prescribed processes and exceeded them where deemed possible and appropriate.
- 5.2 There have been cases in recent years where councils have been challenged on the content of PSPOs that have been deemed as discriminatory in nature and argued to contravene the Human Rights Act 1998. In order to mitigate this risk any new PSPO must target the behaviour itself causing distress and/or alarm. In addition to this there will be a full equality impact assessment (EQIA) to understand and consider any unintended consequences of any new restrictions, particularly on those with protected characteristics and vulnerable people.
- 5.3 There is a risk around unmanaged expectations of enforcement. Throughout the process, we have borne in mind the challenges to enforcement, especially for particular behaviours and in the context of the resources available. Any new PSPO will have an associated enforcement procedure which will include details on how to enforce against specific behaviours. It will be based on the anticipated realities of both Council and Police resources for the duration of the PSPO.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 There are no financial implications arising directly from this report. Should a new PSPO be implemented, there is a financial cost to producing public notices detailing the conditions of the order. These costs are within the remit of the Safer Guildford Partnership budget.

7. Legal Implications

- 7.1 Under s.59 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, a PSPO can only be granted if the conditions set out in paragraph 3.1.3 above are met. This means that there must be a strong evidence base that identifies specific behaviours that have an impact on the quality of life of those in the community. Without justification for the prohibition, there is a risk that the PSPO could be successfully challenged.
- 7.2 Only “interested people” may challenge the PSPO. An “interested person” is a person who lives in or regularly works in or visits the area. The grounds for challenge are:
- The Council did not have the power to make/vary the PSPO, or to include particular prohibitions or requirements within it; or
 - That the statutory requirements were not complied with.
- 7.3 When making the PSPO, the Council must be satisfied on reasonable grounds that the PSPO is necessary to prevent the occurrence or recurrence of the behaviour, or to prevent an increase in the frequency or seriousness of the activities specified.
- 7.4 As identified above, the PSPO should not cover any behaviours which are already covered by other legislation or byelaws. In other words, they should only be used to cover gaps in legislation. If the PSPO covers the same behaviour as a byelaw, the byelaw is not deemed to have effect within the area covered by the PSPO.

8. Human Resource Implications

- 8.1 There are no direct HR implications arising from this report. The report lists the internal teams supporting the review.
- 8.2 The implications of a new PSPO being developed would place human resource requirements on officers, primarily in the Compliance Team. Alignment to resources, policies and approaches to enforcement is discussed in paragraph 3.5.9 of this report. The mitigation of risks associated with expectations on resources is discussed in paragraph 5.3 of this report.

9. Equality and Diversity Implications

- 9.1 An equality impact assessment will be completed before any decisions to amend the current PSPO or implement a new PSPO are made.
- 9.2 The implications of a new PSPO and the potential unintended consequences of any new restrictions, particularly on those with protected characteristics and vulnerable people are discussed in paragraph 5.2 of this report.

10. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications

10.1 There are no climate change/sustainability implications arising from this report.

11. Conclusion

11.1 In order to review the current PSPO and consider the scope of new one, we have followed the process set out in the statutory and LGA guidance. We will continue to adhere to the prescribed processes to ensure:

- the review process remains robust to challenge,
- the outcome of the review and legal tests of any new PSPO are met, and
- any associated risk to the Council is managed

12. Appendices

Appendix one – Partner survey questions.

Appendix two – Public survey questions.

Service	Sign off date
<i>Finance / S.151 Officer</i>	<i>27/07/2021</i>
<i>Legal / Governance</i>	<i>15/07/2021</i>
<i>HR</i>	<i>26/7/2021</i>
<i>Equalities</i>	<i>26/07/2021</i>
<i>Lead Councillor</i>	<i>27/07/2021</i>
<i>CMT</i>	<i>20/07/2021</i>
<i>Committee Services</i>	<i>28/07/2021</i>

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix one – Partner survey questions

As a key partner for Community Safety in the Borough, we would like to understand your views and experiences of antisocial behaviour (ASB) in order to develop a new Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for Guildford.

PSPOs are powers available to local authorities to restrict certain problem behaviours and ensure that public spaces are safe and enjoyable for everyone to use.

This survey relates to the review of the town centre PSPO, which currently helps to tackle antisocial behaviour by preventing the drinking of alcohol in town centre public spaces.

Antisocial behaviour is any behaviour that is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to others. It can be classed as personal, nuisance or environmental.

We would be very grateful for your help in identifying the main antisocial behaviour types, the effect they are having on the local community and evidence that a PSPO will help tackle the problem.

We are aware that antisocial behaviour has changed due to the current Coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic and lockdown restrictions. As the PSPO will last for at least three years, it is important for us to focus on long-term issues as well as current ones. The survey will therefore gather your views on long-term, seasonal and lockdown-related behaviour.

This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Thank you for your participation.

For more information please visit www.guildford.gov.uk/pspo or email communitysafety@guildford.gov.uk

1. Please fill in your contact details below. *

Name:	<input type="text"/>
Organisation:	<input type="text"/>
Email address:	<input type="text"/>
Phone number:	<input type="text"/>

2. Do you feel the current town centre PSPO effectively tackles alcohol-related antisocial behaviour?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Unsure

If not, why?

3. What antisocial behaviour issues do you feel need addressing in Guildford?

- ☐ Alcohol
- ☐ Drugs
- ☐ Psychoactive substances (Legal Highs)
- ☐ Large gatherings
- ☐ Noise
- ☐ Vandalism, criminal damage or graffiti
- ☐ Litter
- ☐ Vehicles
- ☐ Animals
- ☐ Drones
- ☐ Fireworks
- ☐ Cycling
- ☐ Fires / barbecues
- ☐ None
- ☐ Other (please specify):

Comments:

4. Where do the antisocial behaviour issues you have identified take place?

	Town centre	Residential	Rural
Alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drugs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Psychoactive substances (Legal Highs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Large gatherings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vandalism, criminal damage or graffiti	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Town centre	Residential	Rural
Litter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vehicles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Animals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fireworks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fires / barbecues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
None	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide details of any specific locations.

5. When do the antisocial behaviour issues you have identified take place?

	Long term / Ongoing	COVID / Lockdown related	Seasonal
Alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drugs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Psychoactive substances (Legal Highs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Large gatherings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vandalism, criminal damage or graffiti	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Litter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vehicles	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Animals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fireworks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cycling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fires / barbecues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
None	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide any specific details.

6. Evidencing these issues is key to the PSPO process. What evidence can you provide to prove the scale and impact of the antisocial behaviour issues you have identified?

- ☐ Reporting data
- ☐ Incident logs
- ☐ Impact statements
- ☐ No evidence available
- ☐ Other (please specify):

Please provide any specific details.

7. Who is affected by the antisocial behaviour issues you have identified?

- ☐ People who live in the area
- ☐ People who work in the area
- ☐ People who visit the area
- ☐ Vulnerable groups
- ☐ Other (please specify):

What is the impact of the antisocial behaviour issues you have identified?

8. Do you feel that a PSPO is the appropriate method to tackle the antisocial behaviour issues you have identified?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure

If not, why not and are there any other measures you feel are needed?

9. How do you feel PSPO enforcement of these issues could benefit those who live, work and visit the area?

10. Any other comments or suggestions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix two – Public survey questions

Introduction

Thank you for taking time to fill out our survey which will help us to reduce anti-social behaviour in our town centre. It will take around 5 minutes. Before you start please read below:

What is a PSPO?

A PSPO is a Public Spaces Protection Order, it is used to tackle anti-social behaviour issues and was introduced by the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. If people break the conditions of the PSPO they can be prosecuted. Anti-social behaviour is any behaviour that is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to others.

Why do we want your feedback?

Our [current town centre](#) PSPO (2020) helps to reduce anti-social behaviour by stopping people drinking alcohol in public spaces. Your views are really important to understand whether we need to change the PSPO or develop other ways to help reduce anti-social behaviour in the town centre and throughout the borough.

Before we change our PSPO we need consult with the Police, owners or occupiers of land within the affected area where reasonably practicable, appropriate community representatives and the general public.

Coronavirus (Covid-19) impact

We are aware that anti-social behaviour has changed due to the current Covid-19 pandemic and lockdown restrictions. As a PSPO can last for up to three years, it is important for us to focus on long-term issues that existed before lockdown began in March 2020.

Prefer to complete the survey on paper?

For more information or to request a paper copy of the questionnaire, please visit our website, email communitysafety@guildford.gov.uk or call 01483 505050.

About you

The answers to these questions will help us understand who anti-social behaviour in Guildford affects and where it takes place.

1. Are you: (please tick all that apply)

- ☐ A resident of Guildford borough
- ☐ A visitor to Guildford
- ☐ A business owner in Guildford
- ☐ A student in Guildford
- ☐ A worker in Guildford
- ☐ Other (please specify):

2. How old are you?

- ☐ 17 or younger

- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45-54
- ☐ 55-64
- ☐ 65-74
- ☐ 75+
- ☐ Prefer not to say

3. What is your postcode and the name of your road? (If you are responding to this survey as a Guildford business owner please put the postcode of your business). This information will not be shared and will only be used to better understand the location of anti-social behaviour.

Postcode:	<input type="text"/>
Name of your road:	<input type="text"/>

Your experience of anti-social behaviour

Your answers to these questions will help us understand your experience of anti-social behaviour that existed prior to Covid-19.

4. How often do you visit Guildford town centre?

- ☐ Every day
- ☐ 2 or 3 times a week
- ☐ About once a week
- ☐ A few times a month
- ☐ Once a month
- ☐ Less than once a month

5. Thinking about your experiences in the town centre pre-Covid-19, to what extent do you agree with the following statement: I feel safe in Guildford town centre...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
In the day	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In the evening	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
At night	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. Thinking about your experiences pre-Covid-19, have you been affected by, or witnessed, anti-social behaviour anywhere in the borough of Guildford?

- ☐ Yes, I have been directly affected by anti-social behaviour
- ☐ Yes, I have witnessed anti-social behaviour
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure

7. Would you say this anti-social behaviour is a persistent problem?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure

8. Would you say this anti-social behaviour has a detrimental effect on your quality of life?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure

9. Which of the following have you been directly affected by or witnessed? (Please tick all that apply)

- ☐ Drinking alcohol
- ☐ Drug use (including psychoactive substances/legal highs)
- ☐ Litter
- ☐ Rowdy or inconsiderate behaviour
- ☐ Other (please specify):

10. In which general location(s) does this anti-social behaviour take place? (Please tick all that apply).

- ☐ Near where you live or near your business premises
- ☐ Town centre
- ☐ Other residential
- ☐ Rural

☐ Other (please specify):

11. If there is a specific location where this anti-social behaviour takes place (e.g. road or ward name) please state below.

12. Still thinking about your experience pre-Covid-19, how often does this anti-social behaviour occur?

- ☐ Every day
- ☐ 2 or 3 times a week
- ☐ About once a week
- ☐ A few times a month
- ☐ Once a month
- ☐ Less than once a month

Current PSPO

The current PSPO in Guildford town centre prohibits the drinking of alcohol in public spaces. The PSPO gives the Police and authorised local authority officers the power to issue fixed penalty notices (FPNs) to tackle alcohol related anti-social behaviour. We want to know how aware you are of this PSPO and how effective you think it is.

13. Before beginning this survey, were you aware of the current PSPO prohibiting the drinking of alcohol in public spaces in Guildford town centre?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

14. How effective do you think the current PSPO is at tackling alcohol related anti-social behaviour?

- ☐ Very effective
- ☐ Effective
- ☐ Somewhat effective
- ☐ Not effective
- ☐ Not sure

Anti-social behaviours

In order to decide whether or not we need to develop and implement a new PSPO, we want to know if there are any persistent anti-social behaviours pre-Covid-19 causing a detrimental effect on quality of life in the borough.

15. Thinking about your experiences pre-Covid-19, to what extent do you agree that the below behaviours are a problem in the borough?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Drinking alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drug use (including psychoactive substances/legal highs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Litter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vandalism, criminal damage or graffiti	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rowdy or inconsiderate behaviour	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If you chose 'other' please specify the behaviours here:

16. Where do the behaviours you have specified take place? Please tick all that apply.

- ☐ Near where you live or near your business premises
- ☐ Town centre
- ☐ Other residential
- ☐ Rural
- ☐ Other (please specify):

Locations of anti-social behaviours

In order to decide whether or not we need to develop and implement a new PSPO, we want to know if there are any persistent anti-social behaviours pre-Covid-19 causing a detrimental effect on quality of life in the borough.

17. Thinking about your experiences pre-Covid-19, where do the anti-social behaviours listed below take place? Please tick all that apply. Please use the comment box below to list any specific locations.

Agenda item number: 4
Appendix 2

	Not a problem behaviour	Town centre	Residential	Rural	Not sure
Drinking alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drug use (including psychoactive substances/legal highs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Litter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vandalism, criminal damage or graffiti	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rowdy or inconsiderate behaviour	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If there is a specific location where this anti-social behaviour takes place (e.g. road or ward name) please state below.

18. Still thinking about your experiences pre-Covid-19, how frequently do these behaviours take place?

- ☐ Every day
- ☐ 2 or 3 times a week
- ☐ About once a week
- ☐ A few times a month
- ☐ Once a month
- ☐ Less than once a month

Impact of anti-social behaviour

We need to understand the impact anti-social behaviour is having in order to decide whether or not a PSPO is the right tool to tackle it.

19. What impact do these behaviours have on you?

- ☐ Feeling unsafe/fear
- ☐ Intimidation
- ☐ Violence
- ☐ Physical risk (e.g. broken glass)
- ☐ Loss of amenity (benches)
- ☐ No impact
- ☐ Other (please specify):

Other comments

We welcome your views.

20. Do you have any further comments?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes

If yes please enter your comments below:

21. What happens next?

All responses to the consultation will be analysed and carefully considered along with evidence provided by key partners and Surrey Police. This will help us determine whether a PSPO is the right tool to address problem behaviours and will help us draft a proposal for a new Order. This draft order will be published for further consultation before being adopted.

If implemented, the PSPO will be introduced for a maximum of three years and reviewed on a regular basis.

This page is intentionally left blank

Strategy and Resources Executive Advisory Board Report / Executive Report

Ward(s) affected: All Wards

Report of Director of Strategic Services

Author: Martin Knowles

Email: Martin.Knowles@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: John Rigg

Tel: 07870 555784

Email: John.Rigg@guildford.gov.uk

Date: 9 August 2021 / 24 August 2021

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

Executive Summary

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

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

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

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

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

- SRN2 – M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange 'Road Investment Strategy' scheme
- NR2 and NR3 New rail stations at Guildford West (Park Barn) and Guildford East

(Merrow)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Recommendation to Executive

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

Reason(s) for Recommendation:

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

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

No

1 Purpose of Report

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

2. Strategic Priorities

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

3 Background

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

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

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

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

Reasoned justification

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

What has Changed Since the Plan was Adopted?

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

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

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

Transport Evidence Base used for Local Plan

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

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

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

- 3.18 This is considered to be a high priority for the Local Plan proposed level of growth because of the strategic nature of the improvement and the amount of housing it will potentially unlock.

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

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

PRIORITY - Sustainable Movement Corridor (SMC1-6)

- 3.24 This is also considered to be a high priority in the absence of the A3 through Guildford scheme (SRN1). Again, it will be critical to manage down the amount of traffic generated by the strategic sites at Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill and Weyside Urban Village to make them sustainable communities that are not reliant on car based trips using the A3. The Council and the developers will need to demonstrate to the satisfaction of Highways England that these allocations will

not have a severe impact on the safe and efficient running of the A3, particularly the section between A31 and Stoke Interchange where there are only two running lanes in each direction and there is daily congestion, road safety and environmental issues.

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

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

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

- 3.26 Although phases of the SMC have been developed or implemented by the Council with Local Economic Partnership (LEP) funding, the rest of the routes have not been developed in any detail, with some initial feasibility work undertaken several years ago. A note was prepared for the Local Plan Inspector setting out more detail on how the SMC could work.
https://www.guildford.gov.uk/media/29537/GBC-LPSS-025-A-GBC-note-on-SMC-traffic-on-A3-and-Wisley-SNCI/pdf/GBC-LPSS-025-A_GBC_note_on_SMC_traffic_on_A3_and_Wisley_SNCI.pdf?m=636867962546200000
- 3.27 The SMC has the potential to assist with managing down car usage both on the outskirts of the town where the A3 is used by local traffic but also within the town centre.
- 3.28 The SMC schemes within the town centre should be reviewed alongside the Guildford Economic Regeneration Project (GERP) as it is understood that changes to the highway network are being considered within the remit of this project and this may require the managing down of through traffic in the town centre which could be achieved in part through the SMC.

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

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

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

- 3.34 This is a scheme that is currently being developed by the Council and received planning consent in January 2021. The purpose of the scheme is to draw traffic back onto the A323 locally that currently and will in the future be rat-running along unsuitable lanes in the absence of the scheme. It also enables the

development sites to be properly planned so that development traffic uses the new road bridge rather than diverting onto unsuitable lanes and roads.

<https://www.guildford.gov.uk/ashroadbridge>

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

4. Developer Led Infrastructure Schemes

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

Former Wisley Airfield – strategic allocation (A35)

- 4.2 The former Wisley Airfield site is likely to have the highest proportion of car users out of any strategic site due to its location next to the A3 and M25. However, there is still the opportunity to manage down the vehicular trips from the site using the requirements as set out in the Local Plan allocation:
- (5) A significant bus network to serve the site and which will also serve Effingham Junction railway station and/or Horsley railway station, Guildford and Cobham. This will be provided and secured in perpetuity to ensure that residents and visitors have a sustainable transport option for access to the site
- 4.3 A significant bus network BT2 and BT3 would provide residents with an alternative form of transport to using the car and therefore reduce the dominance of the car. The frequency of the bus services will be key to its success as will the funding mechanism and this is still under negotiation between the developer and SCC.
- (6) An off-site cycle network to key destinations including Effingham Junction railway station, Horsley railway station/Station Parade, Ripley and Byfleet to be provided with improvements to a level that would be attractive and safe for the average cyclist
- 4.4 An off-site cycle network to key destinations will also reduce the amount of car trips but this is very much seasonal and weather dependent.

Gosden Hill strategic site (A25)

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

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

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

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

Blackwell Farm strategic site (A26)

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

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

4.17 See the comments on requirement (3) below.

- (3) A through vehicular link which will be controlled is required via the above accesses between the A31 Farnham Road and Egerton Road to provide a new route for employees and emergency services to the Surrey Research Park, the University of Surrey's Manor Park campus and the Royal Surrey County Hospital, as well as a choice of vehicular access for the new residents/occupiers. This will reduce impact on the A31/A3 junction, in advance of the delivery of Highways England's A3 Guildford scheme

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

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

4.19 This has previously been discussed under SMC benefits.

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

4.20 This has previously been discussed under SMC benefits.

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

4.21 This has previously been discussed under SMC benefits.

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

4.22 This has previously been discussed under Guildford stations.

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

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

Other infrastructure schemes

- 4.24 The above discussion does not include a number of schemes in the Infrastructure Schedule. They are schemes that will be the responsibility of stakeholders such as Network Rail, Highways England, or Surrey County Council.
- 4.25 Some of the smaller schemes may be delivered through S106 contributions or through the Community Infrastructure Levy when it is adopted.

5. Consultations

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

6. Key Risks

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

7. Financial Implications

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

8. Legal Implications

- 8.1 As there is currently no budget allocated to this, Full Council decision may be required if budget is to be allocated to the matter prior to the next Budget Council meeting.
- 8.2 Contracts for the feasibility study work will need to be procured in line with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 and the Council's Procurement Procedure Rules. Contracts should be put in place to deliver the studies.
- 8.3 Section 106 payments must be spent in accordance with the terms of the relevant Section 106 agreement. A full business case should be developed for each scheme prior to applying for external funding. If external funding is granted it must be spent in accordance with the relevant funding agreement
- 8.4 Surrey County Council and Highways England are the relevant highways authorities and their support is fundamental to bringing forward the highway infrastructure schemes. Network Rail and any third party landowners affected by the schemes should be engaged early. Title reviews will be required at an early stage so ownership issues and title restrictions are factored into the scheme.

9. Human Resource Implications

- 9.1 No HR implications apply.

10. Equality and Diversity Implications

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

11. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications

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

12. Summary of Options

- 12.1 The options available to the Executive are considered to be as follows:
 - 1. Support the five priorities;
 - 2. Not support the five priorities;
 - 3. Wait until further transport modelling has been undertaken to demonstrate with a higher degree of evidence and therefore confidence what the key priorities are.
- 12.2 Supporting the five priorities now will enable officers to engage with stakeholders to gain their support and will enable discussions to commence regarding how potential funding of these schemes can be achieved. Support for these schemes will also assist with future transport modelling of them as there is a risk that the

highway authorities (Surrey County Council and Highways England) will not support modelling highway and transport schemes that do not have stakeholder support and an outline funding plan.

13. Conclusion

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

14. Background Papers

None.

15. Appendices

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

This page is intentionally left blank

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

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

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

Agenda item number: 5
Appendix 1

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

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

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

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

Agenda item number: 5
Appendix 1

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

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



THE FORWARD PLAN

(INCORPORATING NOTICE OF KEY DECISIONS TO BE TAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE AND NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE)

Schedule 1 to this document sets out details of the various decisions that the [Executive](#) and full [Council](#) are likely to take over the next twelve months in so far as they are known at the time of publication. Except in rare circumstances where confidential or exempt information is likely to be disclosed, all decisions taken by the Executive and full Council are taken in public, and all reports and supporting documents in respect of those decisions are made available on our website.

Members of the public are welcome to attend and, in most cases, participate in all of our meetings and should seek confirmation as to the timing of any proposed decision referred to in the Forward Plan from the Committee Services team by telephone on 01483 444102, or email committeeservices@guildford.gov.uk prior to attending any particular meeting (see note below for special arrangements for remote meetings during the Coronavirus crisis).

Details of the membership of the Executive and the respective areas of responsibility of the Leader of the Council and the lead councillors are set out in Schedule 2 to this document.

Key decisions

As required by the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, this document also contains information about known key decisions to be taken during this period.

A key decision is defined in the Council's Constitution as an executive decision which is likely to result in expenditure or savings of at least £200,000 or which is likely to have a significant impact on two or more wards within the Borough.

A key decision is indicated in Schedule 1 by an asterisk in the first column of each table of proposed decisions to be taken by the Executive.

In order to comply with the publicity requirements of Regulation 9 of the 2012 Regulations referred to above, we will publish this document at least 28 clear days before each meeting of the Executive by making it available for inspection by the public on our website: <http://www.guildford.gov.uk/ForwardPlan>

Availability of reports and other documents

Subject to any prohibition or restriction on their disclosure, copies of, or extracts from, any document to be submitted to a decision-maker for consideration in relation to a matter in respect of which a decision is to be made will normally be available for inspection on our website five clear working days before the meeting, or the date on which the proposed decision is to be taken. Other documents relevant to a matter in respect of which a decision is to be made may be submitted to the Executive, or to an individual decision maker, before the meeting or date on which the decision is to be taken, and copies of these will also be available online.

Taking decisions in private

Where, in relation to any matter to be discussed by the Executive, the public may be excluded from the meeting due to the likely disclosure of confidential or exempt information, the documents referred to above may not contain any such confidential or exempt information.

In order to comply with the requirements of Regulation 5 of the 2012 Regulations referred to above, Schedule 1 to this document will indicate where it is intended to deal with any matter in private due to the likely disclosure of confidential or exempt information. Where applicable, a statement of reasons for holding that part of the meeting in private together with an invitation to the public to submit written representations about why the meeting should be open to the public when the matter is dealt with will be set out on the relevant page of Schedule 1.

James Whiteman
Managing Director

Guildford Borough Council
Millmead House
Millmead Guildford
GU2 4BB

Dated: 27 July 2021

SCHEDULE

EXECUTIVE SHAREHOLDER AND TRUSTEE COMMITTEE: 24 August 2021

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
Page 61	Sutherland Memorial Park - Cricket Pavilion	Consent to enter into a licence with Sunshine Nursery (Guildford) Limited and to apply to the Charity Commission to extend the charitable objects of the Burpham War Memorial.	No	Report to Executive Shareholder and Trustee Committee (24/08/2021)	Damien Cannell 01483 444553 damien.cannell@guildford.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE: 24 August 2021

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer	Agenda item number:
	Capital and Investment outturn report 2020-21	To review the Capital and Investment outturn report 2020-21.	No	Report to Executive (24/08/2021) and Council (05/10/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (29/07/2021)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk	5
	Revenue Outturn Report 2020-21	To review the Revenue Outturn Report 2020-21	No	Report to Executive (24/08/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (29/07/2021)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk	

	Housing Revenue Account Final Accounts 2020-21	To consider the Housing Revenue Account Final Accounts 2020-21	No	Report to Executive (24/08/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (29/07/2021)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk
	Data Protection Policy	To approve updates to the Data Protection Policy	No	Report to Executive (24/08/2021)	Ciaran Ward 01483 444072 ciaran.ward@guildford.gov.uk
*	Priority List of Highway and Transport Schemes Critical to Local Plan Delivery	To approve the Highways and Transport Scheme.	No	Report to Executive (24/08/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Strategy and Resources EAB (09/08/2021)	Martin Knowles (No Tel no.) martin.knowles@guildford.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE: 21 September 2021

Agenda item number: 6

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
	Policy on Debt Recovery	To develop a policy on how the Council manages debt recovery	No	Report to Executive (21/09/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Service Delivery EAB (09/09/2021)	Siobhan Rumble 01483 444296 siobhan.rumble@guildford.gov.uk Belinda Hayden 01483 444867 belinda.hayden@guildford.gov.uk
	Council Tax CAB Protocol	To consider and approve the protocol.	No	Report to Executive (21/09/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Service Delivery EAB (09/09/2021)	Belinda Hayden 01483 444867 belinda.hayden@guildford.gov.uk

<p>*</p>	<p>Weyside Urban Village Programme</p>	<p>The Executive to approve the following proposals as part of the Weyside Urban Village Programme;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Construction budget for the proposed GBC Depot relocation. 2) The agreement with Surrey County Council for the delivery of a new waste transfer station and CRC, together with land transfers. 3) To note the progress to date and make the necessary adjustments to the provisional and approved capital programmes to ensure the project progresses in accordance with the approved financial milestones. 	<p>No</p>	<p>Report to Executive (21/09/2021)</p>	<p>Caroline Cheesman 01483 444011 caroline.cheesman@guildford.gov.uk</p>
<p>Page 65</p>	<p>Approval of the Land Disposals Policy and Guidance Document</p>	<p>To formally approve the policy</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Report to Executive (21/09/2021)</p>	<p>Melissa Bromham 01483 444587 melissa.bromham@guildford.gov.uk</p>

<p>*</p>	<p>Funding Request from Network Rail towards Ash Vale Station Step Free Access Project</p>	<p>To consider contributions towards the Network Rail Ash Vale Station Step Free Access Project</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Report to Executive (21/09/2021)</p>	<p>Donald Yell 01483 444659 donald.yell@guildford.gov.uk</p>
----------	--	---	-----------	---	--

Agenda item number: 6

SPECIAL MEETING OF EXECUTIVE: 30 September 2021

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
*	Local Plan Panel	To consider the Regulation 19 proposed submission plan.	No	Report to Executive (30/09/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Joint EAB (20/09/2021)	Stuart Harrison 01483 444512 stuart.harrison@guildford.gov.uk

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL: 30 September 2021

Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
Local Plan Panel	To recommend to Council the approval of the Regulation 19 proposed submission plan.	No	Report to Council (30/09/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Joint EAB (20/09/2021) and Executive (30/09/2021)	Stuart Harrison 01483 444512 stuart.harrison@guildford.gov.uk

COUNCIL: 5 October 2021

Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
The Council's Constitution: Review of Financial Procedure Rules	To review and update the Financial Procedure Rules	No	Report to Council (05/10/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (23/09/2021)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk
Capital and Investment outturn report 2020-21	To approve the Capital and Investment outturn report 2020-21	No	Report to Council (05/10/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (29/07/2021) And Executive (24/08/2021)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE: 26 October 2021

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
* Page 70	Guildford West Station	GRIP 3 Outcome report (update report) and future procurement of GRIP stages.	No	Report to Executive (26/10/2021)	Mike Miles 01483 444077 mike.miles@guildford.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE: 23 November 2021

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
Page 71	Public Space Protection Order (PSPO)	To approve the Public Space Protection Order (PSPO)	No	Report to Executive (23/11/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Strategy EAB (09/08/2021)	Yasmine Makin 01483 444070 yasmine.makin@guildford.gov.uk
	Timetable of Council and Committee Meetings 2022-23	To recommend to Council the approval of the timetable of Council and Committee Meetings 2022-23	No	Report to Executive (23/11/2021) and Council (07/12/2021)	Carrie Anderson 01483 444078 carrie.anderson@guildford.gov.uk
	Ash Road Bridge and Footbridge Update	To consider the update.	No	Report to Executive (23/11/2021)	Michael Miles 01483 444077 michael.miles@guildford.gov.uk

COUNCIL: 7 December 2021

Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
Gambling Act 2005: Statement of Principles 2022-25	To adopt the Gambling Act 2005: Statement of Principles 2022-25	No	Report to Council (07/12/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Licensing Committee (24/11/2021)	Mike Smith 01483 444387 mike.smith@guildford.gov.uk
Timetable of Council and Committee Meetings 2022-23	To recommend to Council the approval of the timetable of Council and Committee Meetings 2022-23	No	Report to Council (07/12/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Executive (23/11/2021)	Carrie Anderson 01483 444078 carrie.anderson@guildford.gov.uk
Appointment of External Auditors	To consider options for the appointment of external auditors	No	Report to Council (07/12/2021) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (18/11/2021)	Claire Morris 01483 444827 claire.morris@guildford.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE: 4 January 2022

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
Page 73					

EXECUTIVE: 25 January 2022

Agenda item number: 6

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
Page 74	Annual Audit Letter 2020-21	To approve the Annual Audit Letter 2020-21.	No	Report to Executive (25/01/2022) Incorporating comments/ Recommendations of Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (20/01/2022)	Claire Morris 01483 444827 claire.morris@guildford.gov.uk
	Capital and Investment Strategy (2022-23 to 2025-26)	To recommend to Council the approval of the Capital and Investment Strategy (2022-23 to 2025-26)	No	Report to Executive (25/01/2022) and Council (09/02/2022) Incorporating comments/ Recommendations of Joint EAB (10/01/2022) Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (20/01/2022)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk

	Housing Revenue Account Budget 2022-23	To recommend to Council approval of the HRA Revenue estimates, associated fees and charges, changes to rents of Council dwellings and approval of Housing Capital Programme for 2022-23.	No	Report to Executive (25/01/2022) incorporating comments/ recommendations of the Joint EAB (10/01/2022) and Council (09/02/2022)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk
Page 75	Business Planning – General Fund Budget 2022-23	To recommend to Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of the general fund revenue budget for 2022-23 • Agreement of a council tax requirement for 2022-23 • Declaration of any surplus/deficit on the collection fund 	No	Report to Executive (25/01/2022) Incorporating comments/ Recommendations of Joint EAB (10/01/2022) and Council (09/02/2022)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk

COUNCIL: 9 February 2022 (Budget Council)

Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
Capital and Investment Strategy (2022-23 to 2025-26)	To approve the Capital and Investment Strategy (2022-23 to 2025-26)	No	Report to Council (09/02/2022) Incorporating comments/ Recommendations of Corporate Governance and Standards Committee (17/01/2022) And Executive (25/01/2022)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk
Housing Revenue Account Budget 2022-23	To recommend to Council approval of the HRA Revenue estimates, associated fees and charges, changes to rents of Council dwellings and approval of Housing Capital Programme for 2022-23.	No	Report to Council (09/02/2022) incorporating comments/ recommendations of the Joint EAB (10/01/2022) and Executive (25/01/2022)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk
Business Planning – General Fund Budget 2022-23	To approve: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the general fund revenue budget for 2022-23 a council tax requirement for 2022-23 Declaration of any surplus/ deficit on the collection fund	No	Report to Council (09/02/2022) incorporating comments/ recommendations of the Executive (25/01/2022)	Victoria Worsfold 01483 444834 victoria.worsfold@guildford.gov.uk

Pay Policy Statement 2022-23	To approve the Pay Policy Statement 2022-23	No	Report to Council (09/02/2022)	Francesca Smith 01483 444014 francesca.smith@guildford.gov.uk
---------------------------------	--	----	-----------------------------------	---

EXECUTIVE: 22 February 2022

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer

COUNCIL: 23 February 2022 (Reserve Budget Date)

Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer

Agenda item number: 6

EXECUTIVE: 22 March 2022

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer

COUNCIL: 5 April 2022

Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer

EXECUTIVE: 26 April 2022

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
	Annual Governance Statement 2021-22	To adopt the Council's Annual Governance Statement for 2021-22	No	Report to Executive (26/04/2022) Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Corporate Governance and Standards (24/03/2022)	John Armstrong 01483 444102 john.armstrong@guildford.gov.uk

COUNCIL: 11 May 2022 (Annual Council Meeting)

Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
Election of Mayor and appointment of Deputy Mayor 2022-23	To elect a Mayor and appoint a Deputy Mayor for the municipal year 2022-23.	No	Report to Council (11/05/2022)	John Armstrong 01483 444102 john.armstrong@guildford.gov.uk
Appointment of Honorary Remembrancer 2022-23	To appoint the Honorary Remembrancer for the municipal year 2022-23.	No	Report to Council (11/05/2022)	John Armstrong 01483 444102 john.armstrong@guildford.gov.uk

UNSCHEDULED ITEMS – EXECUTIVE/COUNCIL

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is likely to be a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision- maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
*	Bridges – Inspection and Remedial Work	<p>(1) To approve appointment of consultants to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) carry out inspections (b) cost immediate and long-term works (c) advise on future inspection frequency <p>(2) To approve works that arise from inspections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Move money from provisional to approved capital programme. 	No	Report to Executive	<p>Helen Buck 01483 444720 helen.buck@guildford.gov.uk</p>
u	New Corporate Priorities and Corporate Plan	To consider the schedule for the adoption of the new Corporate Plan.	No	Report to Executive	<p>Steve Benbough 01483 444052 stephen.benbough@guildford.gov.uk</p>

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is likely to be a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision- maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
u	The Housing Allocation Scheme	Executive to agree updated scheme for Housing Allocation. <i>Scheme will not come forward until 2022.</i>	No	Report to Executive Incorporating comments/ Recommendations of Service Delivery EAB	Siobhan Kennedy 01483 444247 siobhan.kennedy@guildford.gov.uk
*u	New Housing Strategy (including Homelessness Prevention and Rough Sleeping Strategies) 2020-2025	To develop a new housing strategy to include the statutory elements of homelessness prevention and rough sleeping. <i>Dependent on Corporate Plan, maybe delivered at the end of 2021/start of 2022.</i>	No	Report to Executive Incorporating comments/ Recommendations of Service Delivery EAB	Siobhan Kennedy 01483 444247 siobhan.kennedy@guildford.gov.uk
u	Sutherland Memorial Park	To renew the lease to Guildford City Youth Project <i>Under review.</i>	No	Executive Shareholder and Trustee Committee	Beejal Soni 01483 444036 beejal.soni@guildford.gov.uk
u	Foxenden Tunnels	To consider the potential alternative future uses of the Shelter, possibly including a heritage element. <i>This project is completely dependent on the Covid19 situation, Consequently, the project has been deferred. No date.</i>	No	Executive Shareholder and Trustee Committee (TBA)	Scott Jagdeo 01483 444586 scott.jagdeo@guildford.gov.uk

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is likely to be a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision- maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
u	Charging for Regulatory Services	To consider proposal to charge for pre- application advice. <i>Not a priority at this time.</i>	No	Executive	Justine Fuller 01483 444370 Justine.fuller@guildford.gov.uk
*u	Transfer of Gosden Common to Bramley Parish Council	To consider and approve the transfer of Gosden Common to Bramley Parish Council – <i>Officers are obtaining a legal quote for specialist legal advice so the item can be progressed.</i>	No	Executive	Fiona Williams 01483 444999 fiona.williams@guildford.gov.uk

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is likely to be a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision- maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
*u	Surrey Waste Partnership – Inter Authority Agreement	To confirm the formation of a Joint Committee to replace the Surrey Waste Partnership, to seek sign up to a relevant IAA and to agree what decisions around waste and what services we want delivered via a joint approach. <i>Report estimated Spring 2022.</i>	No	Executive	Chris Wheeler 01483 445030 chris.wheeler@guildford.gov.uk
*u	Resurfacing of Westfield and Moorfield Roads	To agree the budget to be transferred from the provisional to the approved budget. <i>Currently waiting for the completion of phase 1, following which a review will be made relating to programme for phase 2.</i>	No	Executive	Michael Lee- Dickson 01483 445123 michael.lee- dickson@guildford.gov. uk
*u	Industrial Estates	To consider strategies for the future development of individual industrial estates <i>Report estimated 2022.</i>	No	Report to Executive Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Strategy and Resources EAB	Melissa Bromham 01483 444587 melissa.bromham@guildford.gov.uk

Key Decision (asterisk indicates that the decision is likely to be a key decision)	Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision- maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
*u	Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule	To adopt the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule <i>No schedule yet.</i>	No	Report to Executive Incorporating comments/ recommendations of Guildford Joint Committee	Stuart Harrison 01483 444512 stuart.harrison@guildford.gov.uk
*u	Marketing Requirements SPD	To adopt the Marketing Requirements SPD <i>No schedule yet.</i>	No	Report to Executive	Gavin Stonham 01483 444464 gavin.stonham@guildford.gov.uk
*u	Planning Contributions SPD	To adopt the Planning Contributions SPD <i>No schedule yet.</i>	No	Report to Executive	Stuart Harrison 01483 444512 stuart.harrison@guildford.gov.uk
*u	Green and Blue Infrastructure SPD	To adopt the Green and Blue Infrastructure SPD. <i>No schedule yet.</i>	No	Report to Executive	Dan Knowles 01483 444605 dan.knowles@guildford.gov.uk
*u	Green Belt SPD	To adopt the Green Belt SPD <i>No schedule yet.</i>	No	Report to Executive	Laura Howard 01483 444626 laura.howard@guildford.gov.uk

*u	Review of Refuse and Recycling Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To report back on Phase 2 of the review To agree future waste collection methodology <p><i>Report estimated Autumn 2021.</i></p>	No	Report to Executive incorporating comments/recommendations from Service Delivery EAB	Chris Wheeler 01483 445030 chris.wheeler@guildford.gov.uk
----	--	---	----	--	---

UNSCHEDULED ITEMS – GUILDFORD JOINT COMMITTEE

Subject	Decision to be taken	Is the matter to be dealt with in private?	Documents to be submitted to decision-maker for consideration in relation to the matter in respect of which the decision is to be made.	Contact Officer
Community Infrastructure Delivery	<p>(1) To agree a statement of priority for the delivery of infrastructure described in the GBC Infrastructure Delivery Plan and informed by the GBC Regulation 123 list</p> <p>(2) To discuss and propose strategies for securing additional funding necessary for that delivery</p> <p><i>Anticipated to be produced in 12 months from current date 24/07/2020</i></p>	No	Report to Guildford Joint Committee	<p>Stuart Harrison 01483 444512 stuart.harrison@guildford.gov.uk</p>

SCHEDULE 2

MEMBERSHIP OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL'S EXECUTIVE

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL & LEAD COUNCILLORS GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Councillor	Areas of Responsibility
Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Service Delivery Councillor Joss Bigmore c/o Guildford Borough Council Millmead House Millmead Guildford GU2 4BB (Christchurch Ward)	Customer Service, Governance including corporate Health and Safety, Future Guildford, Human Resources, Partnerships, Web Services, Corporate Strategy and Communications
Deputy Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Climate Change Councillor Jan Harwood c/o Guildford Borough Council Millmead House Millmead Surrey GU2 4BB (Merrow Ward)	Innovation, Strategic Planning, Sustainable Transport, Housing Delivery
Lead Councillor for Resources Councillor Tim Anderson c/o Guildford Borough Council Millmead House Millmead Guildford GU2 4BB (Clandon & Horsley Ward)	Finance, Commercial Asset Management, Procurement
Lead Councillor for Development Management Councillor Tom Hunt c/o Guildford Borough Council Millmead House Millmead Surrey GU2 4BB (Friary & St.Nicolas Ward)	Development Control and Enforcement

Councillor	Areas of Responsibility
<p>Lead Councillor for Community and Housing</p> <p>Councillor Julia McShane</p> <p>75 Applegarth Avenue Park Barn Guildford Surrey GU2 8LX</p> <p>(Westborough Ward)</p>	<p>Health, Wellbeing, Access and Disability, Safety, grants and voluntary services, Careline, Handyperson, Care and Repair, Housing, Homelessness, housing standards (HMOs, private rented sector)</p>
<p>Lead Councillor for Economy</p> <p>Councillor John Redpath</p> <p>12 Addison Road Guildford GU1 3QP</p> <p>(Holy Trinity Ward)</p>	<p>Economic Development, Social Enterprise, Rural Economy, Heritage and Community Assets</p>
<p>Lead Councillor for Regeneration</p> <p>Councillor John Rigg</p> <p>C/o Guildford Borough Council Millmead House Millmead Guildford GU2 4BB</p> <p>(Holy Trinity Ward)</p>	<p>Town Centre MasterPlan, Infrastructure, Major Projects, Strategic Asset Management</p>
<p>Lead Councillor for Environment</p> <p>Councillor James Steel</p> <p>c/o Guildford Borough Council Millmead House Millmead Surrey GU2 4BB</p> <p>(Westborough Ward)</p>	<p>Waste, Licensing (including Health and Safety regulation), Parking, Parks and Leisure, Arts and Tourism, Bereavement, Environmental Health and Protection.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD WORK PROGRAMME

Corporate Plan and Forward Plan items are intended to give the EABs an early opportunity to consider major policies or projects.

STRATEGY AND RESOURCES EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

11 OCTOBER 2021					
Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
Citizens' Advice Funding	To consider this mandate.		Cllr Julia McShane	Steve Benbough, Strategy and Communications Manager	
Voluntary Grants Schemes	This mandate will be presented for consideration.		Cllr Julia McShane	Steve Benbough, Strategy and Communications Manager	
Green Electricity Supply	This mandate will be presented for consideration.		Cllr Jan Harwood	Paul Taylor-Armstrong Climate Change Officer	
Climate Change Programme	To consider this mandate.		Cllr Jan Harwood	Paul Taylor-Armstrong Climate Change Officer	
6 DECEMBER 2021					
Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
7 FEBRUARY 2022					
Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
4 APRIL 2022					
Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD WORK PROGRAMME

JOINT EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD

20 SEPTEMBER 2021					
Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
Local Plan Development Management Policies	To consider the Regulation 19 proposed submission plan.	Yes	Cllr Jan Harwood	Stuart Harrison, Planning Policy Manager	
11 NOVEMBER 2021					
Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
Business Planning - General Fund Outline Budget 2022-23	To consider the outline budget and submit comments to the Executive	No	Cllr Tim Anderson	Claire Morris Resources Director	February 2022
10 JANUARY 2022					
Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
Housing Revenue Account Draft Budget 2022-23	To consider the Draft HRA budget and submit comments to the Executive.	No	Cllr Julia McShane / Cllr Tim Anderson	Ian Doyle, Service Delivery Director	February 2022
Capital and Investment Strategy 2022-23 to 2026-27	To consider the Draft Capital and Investment Strategy and submit comments to the Executive.	No	Cllr Tim Anderson	Victoria Worsfold, Lead Specialist - Finance	February 2022

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD WORK PROGRAMME

UNSCHEDULED ITEMS

Strategy and Resources Executive Advisory Board

Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority?	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
Implications for Guildford of the 'Surrey Infrastructure Study'	The Surrey Infrastructure Study will be reviewed in the near future and to input into this at that stage.	Yes	Cllr Jan Harwood	Dawn Hudd, Strategic Services Director	
Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) <i>(There is currently no schedule for the SPD's preparation.)</i>	To consider the Planning Contributions, Green & Blue Infrastructure, Greenbelt and Parking SPDs developed to support the Local Plan.	No	Cllr Jan Harwood	Stuart Harrison, Policy Lead – Planning Policy	
Industrial Estates <i>(Report anticipated 2022.)</i>	To consider strategies for the future development of individual industrial estates.	Yes	Cllr Tim Anderson	Melissa Bromham, Investment Property Manager	
Bright Hill and Guildford Park Road, Guildford.	To consider emerging plans for Bright Hill and Guildford Park Road.	No	Cllr John Rigg	Michael Lee-Dickson, SARP Regeneration Lead	

EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARD WORK PROGRAMME

Joint Executive Advisory Board

Item	Additional information	Corporate Plan Priority?	Relevant Lead Councillor(s)	Lead officer	Target completion
Guildford Economic Regeneration (GER) Programme	To consider the economic regeneration of Guildford.	Yes	Cllr John Rigg	Michael Lee-Dickson, SARP Regeneration Lead	
North Street, Guildford, Development Site	To receive a briefing in respect of the North Street Development Site scheme.	Yes	Cllr John Rigg	Andrew Tyldesley, Town Centre Development Lead	
Sutherland Memorial Park	To consider the possible development of a masterplan for the Park to ensure a holistic approach.	No	Cllr James Steel	Jonathan Sewell, Head of Culture, Heritage and Leisure Services	