

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Draft Minutes of a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held at Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on Tuesday, 26th July, 2022

- * The Mayor, Councillor Dennis Booth
- * The Deputy Mayor, Councillor Masuk Miah

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

*Present

CO28 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Liz Hogger, Diana Jones, Steven Lee, Susan Parker, John Redpath, and James Walsh, and also from Honorary Aldermen Catherine Copley, Jayne Marks, Terence Patrick, Tony Phillips, Lynda Strudwick, and Jenny Wicks.

CO29 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosable pecuniary interests.

Councillor Catherine Young declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Agenda Item 9 - Community Governance Review: Parish of West Horsley (see Minute No. CO36 below). Councillor Young was a member of West Horsley Parish Council.

CO30 MINUTES

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

CO31 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor reported that he had had the privilege of visiting the Specsavers Youth Games, The Surrey School Games Summer Festival and Surrey Scoutabout where scores of young people had participated in numerous activities.

The Mayor had also attended the Joint Armed Forces Day Service at the Cathedral to recognise the contribution of the Armed Forces and Service Charities which supported serving and ex-serving members of the Armed forces, Cadets and Veterans.

Earlier this month the Queen's Baton Relay for the Commonwealth Games visited Guildford and the Mayor was very pleased to have attended Newlands Corner to welcome the team before seeing it on its way.

The Mayor was pleased to report that the Mayoress' Ladies Sparkling Afternoon Tea which included a visit to the Chained Library at the Royal Grammar School had been a sell-out and all the ladies who attended had a most enjoyable afternoon and a significant sum had been raised for the Mayor's Charities. The Mayor thanked those Councillors who were able to attend.

CO32 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader of the Council thanked council staff, the Surrey Fire and Rescue Service, and others across the borough who had helped us to deal with the effects of the recent unusually hot weather.

The Leader reported that Guildford had now welcomed nearly 350 Ukrainian guests into 180 sponsors' homes across the borough, visas had been issued to another 200 who were expected to arrive over the coming weeks. Officers across the Council had continued to inspect host properties, conduct DBS checks, deliver welcome payments, and provide welfare support to guests and host families.

The Leader also reported on the recent launch of the discretionary rebate scheme to sit alongside the main Council Tax energy rebate scheme. The original scheme had focused on Band A- D properties but funding had been received to provide additional support for those in larger properties struggling with the cost of living. Further details including the eligibility criteria were available on the Council's website.

As part of a Safer Guildford Partnership initiative, an updated Guildford Town Centre Public Space Protection Order had been made to make residents and visitors feel even safer in the town centre. This Order empowered the Police and some Council officers to tackle anti-social behaviour including confiscation of alcohol and legal highs, as well as issuing fines of up to £1,000 for breaches of the Order.

The Leader was pleased to announce that the Castle was now open for visitors from 27 July until October 2022.

Finally, the Leader expressed his thanks and best wishes to Claire Morris, Director of Resources after nine years of exceptional service to the Council and residents of the borough.

CO33 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In his capacity as a resident of Edgeley Park, Farley Green, Mr Bob Hughes (County Councillor for the Shere Division) asked the Lead Councillor for Environment, Councillor James Steel, the question set out below. Councillor Steel's response to each element of the question is set out in red type below.

"In relation to Edgeley Park in Farley Green, where I own a lodge, but I am not affected by any of the current problems, to ask the Lead Councillor for Environment,

In the long history of Edgeley Park being licensed for recreational use, is the Council satisfied that the requirements of the current licenses and planning consents issued by Guildford Borough Council are being observed?

Thank you for your questions about Edgeley Park which I know other residents and you have recently raised with Council Officers. The Council is satisfied that the site is correctly licensed as a recreational caravan site and monitoring visits have been conducted to ensure compliance with site conditions, including that occupiers have alternative addresses.

The most recent planning enforcement case, which was an allegation that the site was being used as a primary residence in breach of the planning condition, was closed in 2017 after there was no evidence of any breach of planning control. The Manager of the Park was contacted and provided the Council with a substantial amount of evidence to suggest that the management company, Haulfryn, take the matter seriously and do as much as possible to ensure that the requirements of the condition, and the terms of their site licence, are met. The case officer also visited the site and inspected the database of lodge owners' documents confirming their alternative primary residence.

After I made the Council aware of the imminent change in ownership of Edgeley Park to a new company Haulfryn Ltd on 16th May, what actions and due diligence has the Council undertaken in relation to the new company? Have site licenses Nos: 2450 and 963 now been transferred to Haulfryn Limited?

At this time, we do not have a site transfer request and it is the company's duty to advise the Council of these changes.

Has the Council consulted Albury Parish Council about this change of ownership in light of the many complaints made to them about the running of Edgeley Park?

There is no duty to consult on change of ownership applications at this or other sites.

Is the Council aware that during the last 2 years there have been over one hundred notices issued by Haulfryn companies' alleging breaches and threatening eviction, and that these notices have no basis in law? Is the Council also aware that many of these notices have been issued to owners who are elderly and vulnerable?

I am aware that you discussed this matter at your recent meeting with officers. The Council is aware of letters being sent to residents about compliance with site licence conditions. Investigations have shown that eviction notices and notice periods were all correct and we have not identified any illegal evictions at this time.

Is the Council aware that residential occupation of Edgeley Park commenced in 1990 and continues to this day, with many owners being residential for more than ten years, thereby being immune from planning enforcement? Further, has the Council noted that many owners are resident on Edgeley Park because Haulfryn Group led them to believe that it was open to them to live there, and were further told that they were paying Council Tax through the Haulfryn Group?

As described above from a planning enforcement perspective, we have yet to receive any actual evidence, other than allegations, of a breach of the planning condition. Please report any complaints of mis-selling to Trading Standards who are already investigating these allegations.

Has the Council noted the evidence that Haulfryn Ltd are still advising buyers that they can live at Edgeley Park, and are facing many accusations of mis-selling?

Any complaints about mis-selling need to be passed to Surrey County Council Trading Standards who enforce this area of legislation. Officers have advised that they are in liaison with Trading Standards who are already investigating these allegations.

Given that the Council have a duty of care to the owners and the residents of Edgeley Park, many of whom are elderly and vulnerable, what representations have the Council made to the Haulfryn companies to seek to resolve these problems and to find an acceptable way forward that is humane, decent and legal?

The Council has investigated multiple complaints about compliance with the recreational caravan site licence conditions and to date our investigations have identified no illegal evictions and there are no open cases. During your recent meeting, officers made an offer to review any new evidence concerning breach of caravan site licensing or planning controls. This offer remains and please forward to officers if you wish any new matters to be investigated.

The Lead Councillor was asked the following supplementary question:

- (a) With reference to the statement in the answer that “*The case officer also visited the site and inspected the database of lodge owners' documents confirming their alternative primary residence*” is the Lead Councillor aware that some people have never been asked for documents and many of the people have only been asked to show a driving licence?
- (b) With reference to the statement in the answer that the Council had yet to receive any actual evidence of a breach of planning condition, is the Lead Councillor aware that the residents of Edgeley Park have produced evidence, and that it might be useful to talk to them directly about it?
- (c) With reference to the statement in the answer that the Council did not have a site transfer request following the change in ownership of Edgeley Park to a new company (Haulfryn Ltd), could the Lead Councillor comment as to why there had been no request to Haulfryn to fulfil their part of the licence requiring them to inform the Council, which must constitute a breach of the licence?
- (d) Could the Lead Councillor clarify the status of the site and confirm whether, in planning law, there was no distinction between a holiday or seasonal use and a permanent residential use as a caravan site?

In response, the Lead Councillor reiterated that officers would be happy to receive any further evidence that Edgeley Park residents would like to submit, and this would be considered within the parameters of the existing licence provisions.

CO34 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

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

“Would the Lead Councillor for Climate Change please update the Council on the following?”

1. *How is the Council's Climate Change Action Plan progressing and when are we likely to see a draft for consideration?*

The Council recently filled the vacant role with a dedicated Climate Change Officer to develop a Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP). We have already met with Council officers and climate interest groups within Guildford towards building an holistic, achievable and robust CCAP. We are currently at the data gathering phase of putting the plan together. We have received the 2020-21 Carbon Emissions for the Council and we are co-ordinating our internal service areas to centralise the reporting of climate related projects and initiatives. We are also working to align the Action Plan with existing strategies from SCC (Greener Futures) and the Waverley Action Plan, while addressing the unique challenges that Guildford faces. Estimated draft would be available September – November depending on current findings and

future initiatives. We have planned to present the draft to Executive in November therefore we are aiming to present first to the Climate Change Board at the autumn meeting.

2. *Where are the Council in terms of Community Engagement with regard to Climate Change, and how are we working with Surrey County Council and Waverley to bring this forward urgently? Whatever we do now needs to include raising awareness and also mitigation.*

We are currently in the process of writing a comprehensive Comms strategy in which engagement will feature. This will be available for the Board to review in September. We are also working with Surrey to produce a collaborative comms strategy for the county.

3. *The Climate Change Board's meetings remain ad hoc. Please can these be set for the year ahead now that we have Nat Prodger (Climate Change Officer) in place, so that attendance can be planned and necessary items placed on the agenda - we are all feeling the urgent need to move forward, especially with the issues of Climate Change so prominent in the news last week!*

Meetings are booked for August and September and three further dates are currently planned for November, January, and March, and these will be finalised shortly.

4. *How will the Lead Councillor for Climate Change ensure that Climate Change is given centre stage during the review of the Local Plan?*

Responding to the climate change emergency is embodied in the national legislation and policies that guide the production of Local Plans. Local Plans themselves are required to demonstrate how they have responded to environmental objectives as well as economic and social objectives within the Sustainability Appraisal that is a key document that supports the approach taken in the Local Plan. These objectives are contained within the Corporate Plan which reflects the Councils wider objectives including its approach to climate change. It should be noted that increasingly achieving climate change targets through new development is controlled through the building control function and not the planning process.

5. *Would the Lead Councillor please commit to providing a Climate Change Update as a standing item on the agenda for future Full Council meetings?*

Given that we publish and make available to the public the Climate Change Board papers, which will contain all the necessary updates on progress with various initiatives, I do not believe that committing to provide update reports at every full Council meeting would serve any practical purpose and would not be a beneficial use of our Climate Change Officer's time.

In response to a supplementary question which asked the Lead Councillor to reconsider her response to part 5 of the above question, the Lead Councillor confirmed that she would reconsider the position in due course following discussion with the relevant officers and allowing the new Climate Change Officer time to settle into his new role.

A further supplementary question sought clarification of the response to part 4 of the question, in particular the statement that "*increasingly achieving climate change targets through new development is controlled through the building control function and not the planning process*". The Lead Councillor confirmed that actually both planning and building control had a role to

play and both functions would be actively involved in the work of the Climate Change Board at its next meetings.

In response to a further supplementary question regarding the allocation of sufficient resources to address the climate emergency declaration, the Lead Councillor confirmed that further resources had been allocated for additional officers, including an Energy Officer. A budget of £33,000 was available for the purpose of meeting our green targets, particularly in relation to electricity. The Lead Councillor was confident that additional funding would be allocated. The Leader pointed out that Surrey County Council had made available £450,000 revenue funding from the Empty Homes Scheme. The first tranche was earmarked for this financial year to be spent jointly with the Environment Agency in respect of flood alleviation works. Spending next year would be directed specifically at climate change initiatives driven by the Climate Change Board and the Lead Councillor.

(b) **Councillor Ramsey Nagaty** asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the following question:

“The Guildford Greenbelt Group note in view of the fact that:

- (i) Urgently noting that the current spate of excessive housebuilding in Guildford’s countryside and villages causing growing public anger at GBC’s failure to curb the irreversible damage being done to our village communities and open spaces;*
- (ii) Sharing residents’ alarm at Guildford’s climate emergency and the negative effects of unnecessary development on traffic, air quality and biodiversity;*
- (iii) Recognising that new housing estates at Blackwell Farm, Gosden Hill and Wisley are certain to worsen pollution on the A3 which already exceeds legal limits;*
- (iv) Recalling that housing provision in the town centre from recent new actual and planned developments will exceed the assumptions for housing provision in the town in the 2019 Guildford Local Plan;*
- (v) Observing that the 2021 Census has now fully vindicated claims that the ONS population projections on which the Plan is based are exaggerated and unsound;*
- (vi) Acknowledging that paragraph 61 of the NPPF states that the Standard Method of Calculating Housing Need is not mandatory if “exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals” and that ONS errors in basic population data constitute “exceptional circumstances” within the meaning of this paragraph;*
- (vii) Concerned that almost none of the infrastructure deemed by the Inspector to be vital to the implementation of the Local Plan, including new railway stations and improvements to the A3 through Guildford, have been delivered or are likely to be delivered during the Plan period given the state of the national economy and local finances;*
- (viii) Noting that at least ten local councils, of which nine are Green Belt authorities, have in the last six months abandoned, paused or delayed their Local Plans in response to climate change concerns and national policy uncertainty;*
- (ix) Mindful that GBC have already agreed that a review of transport and other evidence supporting the Plan is necessary;*
- (x) the NPPF allows for greenbelt boundaries to be changed by Local Councils within a Local Plan such Greenbelt can therefore with evidence be removed and or reinstated.*
- (xi) The proposed new sewerage works is based on existing for 90,000 residents with growth up to 120,000 but population already exceeds that before development of the strategic sites and the river Wey is increasingly polluted by TW discharges.*

- (xii) *Accepting that a resource-intensive examination of large, non-contentious parts of the Local Plan evidence base is not a high priority and can safely be postponed until the mandatory five-year review;*
- (xiii) *Dismayed by the current Executive's persistent and inexplicable failure to fulfil their 2019 electoral mandate to review the Local Plan or even to set any strategic goal for doing so;*

Question:

This Council has agreed to work towards a review of the Local Plan by gathering evidence. Can the Leader or Lead Councillor responsible for this work please update Councillors on the areas being addressed with details of the work done to date and confirm that the latest 2021 census figures on population as well as the lack of expected infrastructure that the Inspector relied on to find the Local Plan sound such as the A3 widening and junction improvements, Tesco roundabout improvements and the proposed additional railway stations, none of which appear to be forthcoming during the life of the Local Plan will all be taken into account as part of the evidence base for a review of the Local Plan and that there surely is now compelling evidence to proceed with the Review?"

The Leader's response to the question was as follows:

"Thank you for your question, Councillor Nagaty.

The opinions you claim as fact in the preamble to your question were considered in this chamber on 5 April 2022 where the Full Council (it is not an Executive responsibility as you state) debated and then endorsed a strategy to deal with the timing of a Formal Review and any subsequent update to the Local Plan.

We have a strategy in place to deal with the Review and unfortunately there is no new information that to my mind alters that strategy. The Planning policy team sent a comprehensive explanation of the consequence (or lack thereof) of the census results via email to all Councillors, which I set out below. I wrote to Michael Gove (unfortunately on the morning of his defenestration) and will write again to Greg Clark and both PM candidates highlighting my dismay at the continued use of the Standard Method, and the need to have Housing Plans based on the most recent population data and sound methodology.

The housing requirement in the LPSS used the lower 2016-based household projections as its starting point rather than the higher 2014-based household projections. It is also worthwhile noting that the ONS projections were only the 'starting point' for calculating the housing requirement. This figure is uplifted to address economic and affordability factors. The demographic starting point at the LPSS examination (using the 2016 projections) was 313 dwellings per annum. The LPSS requirement of 562 represented a 79% uplift over the demographic starting point. For the time being government guidance continues to mandate the use of the 2014-based household projections with the Standard Method.

It is worth noting that neither Mole Valley (as part of their current examination process) nor Elmbridge (in their current Regulation 19 consultation) are challenging the validity of their housing need derived from the Standard Method. Instead, both are currently arguing that they are unable to sustainably accommodate this need. As it stands no Council has successfully managed to achieve a lower figure than the Standard Method. This was reaffirmed by leading barrister Mary Cook in her advice that she gave the Council to inform the decision on whether to undertake an early review.

There has been no other change in circumstances to enable us to reconsider, as we said we would, whether it would be advantageous to embark upon an early review of the plan. There is ongoing work being undertaken in relation to the evidence base however the conclusions of this are not yet known. We expect the updated transport evidence later this year and the new evidence to support our Town Centre ambitions in March next year subject to funding approval for phase 3 of Shaping Guildford's Future by the Executive in September. As endorsed by Full Council on 5 April 2022, there was a recommendation 'that the Full Council be updated on the outcomes of the review of the transport evidence base currently underway and any other significant changes in circumstance that may impact on considerations regarding the timing of the Formal Review of the LPSS'. This remains our position".

In response to a supplementary question which sought details of the aspects of the local plan for which the Council was collecting evidence and the details gathered to date, the Leader confirmed that the transport evidence base was currently being worked on with Surrey County Council and National Highways, which was expected by the end of the year. It was expected that other pieces of evidence would be funded in the next phase of the Town Centre Masterplan.

(c) **Councillor Tony Rooth** asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Joss Bigmore, the following question:

"May I ask the Leader of the Council to confirm whether he agrees that, in these times of uncertainty and financial pressure both for the council and Guildford Borough residents, the Council will:

- 1. communicate, inform, involve and consult the residents as extensively, regularly, and consistently as possible*
- 2. remind residents of which council (GBC, SCC) provides which services for them and for which proportion out of the council tax they pay (via general information from council tax bill) and information sent out latest by October 2022 to inform residents of our council's services during the "cost of living crisis"*
- 3. encourage residents to take interest in how the council is run and the decisions the council takes on their behalf*
- 4. regularly inform residents of all forthcoming public council and committee meetings/agenda and extend to all committees, where appropriate the reports procedure adopted by the Planning committee*
- 5. communicate and inform residents via the council's own communications team and external media channels together with a link to the Council's website"*

The Leader's response to the question was as follows:

"Thank you for your question, Cllr Rooth.

As you will know we have committed to values in the recently adopted Corporate Plan ensuring we listen to the views of residents and be open and accountable in our decision-making. I am proud of the way that this Council communicates and cares for its residents in times of stress whether it was during the heatwave of last week, or through the Pandemic. I have no doubt that this work will continue as our residents deal with the effects of the cost-of-living crisis. Over the past year we issued 150 press releases and responded to 250 media enquiries. We have nearly 30,000 followers across our four main corporate social media accounts posting 6,000 times over the past year, generating 9,200 comments of which 72% were positive.

The Council annually informs residents that it receives 9p out of every £1 of council tax and for that what services we provide. We also provide regular service updates through a variety of comms channels. In these times of financial stress, I am not sure

it is a proper use of scarce resource to repeat information that will go out again in Q1 next year with the next round of Council Tax bills. The information is also clearly available on our website for anyone to see at any time. ([Council tax financial information 2022-23 - Guildford Borough Council](#))

It is up to all of us to try and engage residents in Local Government, I for one am frustrated at the general apathy I encounter, but your aims are laudable, and I will increase my efforts.

I am sorry to say that I find your two final points redundant, these communications exist, and many are statutory responsibilities, of course we need to continually monitor and improve the effectiveness of our comms and we must aspire to reach everyone in the Borough”.

The Leader was asked a supplementary question as to whether he would agree to posting information to residents through our normal media channels to set out the functions for which this Council and the County Council were responsible, and to reconsider whether he would agree that the Executive and all committees should adopt the practice of the Planning Committee of prior disclosure of slides, graphs, and presentations intended to be presented to meetings of those bodies.

In response, the Leader indicated that the agenda papers for all committees were published online ahead of every meeting. In addition, we used social media in advance of meetings to highlight matters to be discussed at those meetings.

(d) **Councillor Tony Rooth** asked the Lead Councillor for Regeneration, Councillor John Rigg, the following question:

“Would the Lead Councillor for Regeneration please:

- (a) comment generally on the consultation to be provided by St Edward to view the latest designs for North Street regeneration and in particular for only a 3 week period in early August, the start of the summer holidays; and*
- (b) request St Edward to provide details of their consultation on North Street Regeneration to date, what events they held, where, when, who was invited and who attended in order to gauge how and to what extent the public/residents have been consulted in addition to the usual “stakeholders”, consultants etc.”*

The Lead Councillor’s response to the question was as follows:

“Thank you for the question, Cllr Rooth

Guildford Borough Council can’t dictate to a developer ‘how and when’ they consult with the public. In our Statement of Community Involvement, we recommend that during the pre-app stage a developer undertakes to ‘run exhibitions or public meetings with neighbours, community/amenity groups and appropriate consultation bodies’. Details of these engagements will be set out in the applicants Statement of Engagement that is submitted with the Planning Application.

It is my opinion that the consultation carried out thus far by St Edward has been thorough, professional, and has resulted in many positive changes to the original scheme, most notably to upgrade the existing bus station rather than move it to a new location on Leapale Road.

St Edward has undertaken a two-stage consultation process to date, with a third briefing event planned for this week prior to the submission of their Planning Application. The two-staged events have been online, due to the logistical issues of the COVID-19 pandemic, although this provided access to a wider audience, whilst a physical on-site presence is planned for August.

The consultation website, www.northstreetregeneration.co.uk has had considerable information available for viewing over the course of their involvement in this site, including detailed drawings, plans, videos and other information, the website has enjoyed 10,000 visitors.

St Edward have dropped 10,000 leaflets within 0.5 mile of the site, produced three major Press Releases to the main industry, regional and local media providers. The consultations were advertised on social media to reach over 124,000 people, whilst regular mail updates have been provided to over 500 people that subscribed through the website. Videos following each consultation have been prepared, providing feedback and also outlining the next steps.

A summary of all the events and engagements is added below.

Stage 1 – December 2020

Date	Format	Attendees
10.12.20	Closed workshop via Zoom	Guildford Vision Group The Guildford Society Experience Guildford Guildford Residents Association
14.12.20	Webinar via Zoom – live presentation and subsequent live Q&A	Public
15.12.20	Online consultation via presentation recording, web page content and feedback form	All

Direct invitation	Direct invitations were issued via email to community group representatives and Ward Councillors.
Flyer drop/ Poster	Promotional flyers were distributed by hand at Guildford train station during evening rush hour and posters displayed around Guildford town centre at key locations such as community and public buildings and supermarkets. A5 leaflets that provided details of the public engagement session were also distributed to addresses within a 0.5-mile radius around the site (circa 5,000).
Social media event promotion	Two adverts on Facebook ran for seven days resulting in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reach of 14,814 • Engagements: 236 • Click-throughs to the website: 215
Press release	A press release 'Engaging the community as planning starts for regeneration of North Street, Guildford', was issued to local media outlets, prior to the events: Surrey Advertiser, Surrey Live, The Guildford Dragon, Farnham Herald, BBC Surrey.

- 144 Webinar attendees
- 108 formal feedback forms
- 202 signed up to the mailing list
- Newsletter response issued in hard copy to 5,000 addresses
- 412 views on feedback video

Stage 2 – April 2022

Date	Format	Attendees
25.03.22	Face to face presentation and Q&A	Guildford Vision Group
20.04.22	Face to face presentation and Q&A	Experience Guildford
20.04.22	Presentation and Q&A via Zoom	Guildford Access Group
20.04.22	Face to face presentation and Q&A	The Guildford Society and Guildford Residents Association
25.04.2022	Webinar via Zoom – live presentation and subsequent live Q&A	Public
26.04.2022	Online consultation via presentation recording, web page content and feedback form	All

Direct invitation	Direct invitations to the webinar were issued via email to community group representatives.
Mailer	Two mailers were issued to North Street's community database of 500+ contacts.
Flyer drop/ Poster	Promotional flyers were distributed by hand at Guildford train station during evening rush hour and posters displayed around Guildford town centre at key locations such as community and public buildings and supermarkets. A5 leaflets that provided details of the public engagement session were also distributed to addresses within a 0.5-mile radius around the site (circa 5,000).
Social media event promotion	Four adverts on Facebook ran for twenty days resulting in: Reach of 109,740 Engagements: 3,259 Click-throughs to the website: 3,087
Press release	A press release 'Regenerating North Street, Guildford: Community invited to view latest designs', was issued to local media outlets, prior to the events: Surrey Advertiser, Surrey Live, Farnham Herald, BBC Surrey. Paid advertorial was placed in The Guildford Dragon.

- 187 Webinar attendees
- 53 formal feedback forms
- Newsletter response issued in hard copy to 5,000 addresses
- 201 views on feedback video

Formal Stakeholder Meetings and Public Consultation Dates

Date	Item
16 December 2019	EIA Scoping Update
19 December 2019	Site Walkover
29 January 2020	Bus Station Meeting
19 February 2020	Design & Planning Meeting
26 February 2020	Meeting with Bus Operators, SCC and GBC
23 October 2020	Consultation Strategy Meeting
27 November 2020	Pre-application Meeting 1
10 December 2020	Retail Meeting
14 December 2020	Public Consultation Webinar 1

<u>Date</u>	<u>Item</u>
15 December 2020	Bus Strategy Meeting with GBC
14 January 2021	Pre-application Meeting 2
17 March 2021	Design Update Meeting
6 July 2021	Public Consultation Video Update
26 July 2021	Full Council Presentation
1 November 2021	Design Update Meeting
29 October 2021	Steering Group Meeting 1
16 December 2021	Steering Group Meeting 2
19 January 2022	Steering Group Meeting 3
2 February 2022	Highways and Modelling meeting with SCC
11 February 2022	Pre-App meeting
21 February 2022	Meeting with Bus Operators
14 March 2022	Pre-App re Retail policy
15 March 2022	Highways meeting with SCC
23 March 2022	Design Review Panel
12 April 2022	Pre-app on Energy and Sustainability
20 April 2022	GBC members briefing
25 April 2022	Public consultation
26 April 2022	Pre-App on Scheme evolution
3 May 2022	Highways and Bus meeting with SCC
20 May 2022	Arup bus meeting with SCC
23 May 2022	Highways and Bus meeting with SCC
30 May 2022	Meeting with Tim Oliver and Matt Furniss
23 June 2022	Pre-App on Scheme Design
29 June 2022	Bus Station and Highways Scenarios with SCC
18 July 2022	North Street Bus Station Scenarios with SCC and GBC

In response to supplementary questions which asked why only four groups were involved in the closed workshop on 10 December 2020 and whether it might be possible in future to invite a more diverse set of civic organisations; and for details of the numbers who attended the webinars and the feedback received from them, the Leader reiterated the first point in the written response that the Council could not *dictate to a developer 'how and when' they consult with the public*. The Leader felt that compared to other consultations this had been very good.

The Lead Councillor responded by expressing satisfaction with the quality of the consultation and denying that there was any intention to exclude particular groups from the workshop. The Lead Councillor was confident that the developer would be happy to make a presentation to any interested groups.

CO35 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2021-22

The Council considered a report which outlined the work undertaken by overview and scrutiny during the past municipal year and its future work programme as thus far developed.

Decisions taken during the past municipal year under the 'urgency' provisions and the use of 'call-in' were also detailed within the report. In 2021-22, two decisions had been taken under the urgency provisions of Access to Information Procedure Rules, call-in had been waived by the O&S Committee Chairman on one occasion and no Executive decisions had been called in.

The report had also been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 12 July 2022. The Committee had commended the Annual Report to Council.

Upon the motion of Councillor Paul Spooner, seconded by Councillor Angela Goodwin, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report be commended as the annual report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2020-21.
- (2) That the current rules relating to call in or urgency provisions remain unchanged.

Reasons:

- Article 8.2(d) of the Council's Constitution required the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee to report annually to Full Council on the work undertaken during the year, its future work programme, and amended working methods if appropriate.
- Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16(i), required the operation of the provisions relating to call-in and urgency to be monitored annually and a report submitted to Full Council with proposals for review if necessary.

CO36 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW: WEST HORSLEY PARISH COUNCIL

Councillors were reminded that at its meeting on 9 February 2022, the Council had approved a request from West Horsley Parish Council to conduct a community governance review (CGR) in accordance with provisions of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 ("the 2007 Act") regarding a proposal to increase the maximum number of councillors to be elected to the West Horsley Parish Council from nine councillors to eleven councillors.

The Council considered a report setting out details of the representations received during the consultation period and the options open to the Council in making its formal response to the CGR.

Upon the motion of Councillor Tim Anderson, seconded by Councillor Christopher Barrass, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That, taking account of the statutory considerations, the Council agrees the outcome of the community governance review as follows:
 - (a) to increase the number of parish councillors to be elected to West Horsley Parish Council from nine to eleven with effect from the next scheduled parish council elections in May 2023; and
 - (b) to make no other changes to:
 - (i) the parish of West Horsley or
 - (ii) the electoral arrangements for West Horsley Parish Council.
- (2) That the Democratic Services and Elections Manager be authorised to make a community governance reorganisation order under Section 86 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to give effect to the decision approved in paragraph (1) above, together with all necessary incidental, consequential, transitional or supplementary provisions as may be required to give full effect to the order.

Reason:

To address the community governance request received in respect of this matter with a view to ensuring that community governance within the area under review is:

- reflective of the identities and interests of the community in that area; and
- is effective and convenient.

CO37 REVIEW OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE

The Council noted that, at the meeting of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee on 24 March 2022, an internal audit report prepared by KPMG into the effectiveness of the Committee had recommended, amongst other things, that the Council should consider amending the Committee's terms of reference to:

- (a) include at the beginning a high-level Statement of Purpose, or summary of the Committee's role in the Council's framework of governance; and
- (b) add an explicit section on how the Committee is accountable to the full Council;

It was suggested by KPMG that formal arrangements should be in place for the Committee to demonstrate accountability for the adequacy of its performance to the full Council and, bearing in mind that performance would be assessed against how well the Committee discharged its responsibilities as set out in its terms of reference, it was felt that the opportunity could be taken to review the terms of reference as a whole, including consideration of KPMG's recommendations referred to in (a) and (b) above.

To that end, the Committee agreed that the Corporate Governance Task Group should review the terms of reference and report back to the Committee.

The Task Group considered this matter at its meeting held on 7 April 2022. The proposed amendments to the Committee's terms of reference, as recommended by the Task Group, were considered by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee on 16 June 2022, and the Committee formally commended the amendments for adoption by the Council.

As the Committee's terms of reference were also set out in Article 10 of the Constitution, it would also be necessary to incorporate those changes within Article 10. The amendments to the terms of reference and to Article 10 were set out in the report submitted to the Council.

Upon the motion of the Vice-Chairman of the Corporate Governance & Standards Committee, Councillor Deborah Seabrook, seconded by the Chairman of that Committee, Councillor George Potter, the Council

RESOLVED: That the changes proposed to the terms of reference of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, and the changes proposed to Article 10 of the Constitution, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report, be adopted.

Reasons:

- To ensure that the Committee's terms of reference are updated and remain relevant.
- To address KPMG's recommendations in their internal audit report on the effectiveness of the Committee in respect of its terms of reference.

CO38 REVIEW OF NUMERICAL ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES TO POLITICAL GROUPS: 2022-23

The Council received a report on the review of the allocation of seats on committees, which had been conducted due to the following events:

- (a) on 20 May 2022, Councillor Richard Billington passed away leaving a vacancy in respect of one of the two seats representing the Tillingbourne ward; and

(b) on 4 July 2022, the proper officer (Democratic Services and Elections Manager) received notice in writing from Councillor Jan Harwood that, with immediate effect, he no longer wished to be treated as a member of the Conservative group and wished to be regarded as an independent member.

Consequently, the political balance on the Council was now:

Guildford Liberal Democrats: 16
Residents for Guildford and Villages: 16
Conservatives: 8
Guildford Greenbelt Group: 4
Labour: 2
Independent: 1
Vacancy: 1

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

The report included a suggested numerical allocation of seats on committees to political groups that would best meet, as far as reasonably practicable, the requirements for political balance for the remainder of the 2022-23 Municipal Year.

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

RESOLVED: That the numerical allocation of seats on committees to each political group on the Council, and to the single independent member, as set out below be approved for the remainder of the 2022-23 municipal year:

Committee	Guildford Lib Dems	R4GV	Conservatives	GGG	Labour	Ind
Total no. of seats on the Council (47 + 1 vacancy)	16	16	8	4	2	1
% of no. of seats on the Council	34.04%	34.04%	17.02%	8.51%	4.25%	2.13%
Notional number of seats on committees (Total: 95)	32	32	16	8	4	2
Corporate Governance & Standards Committee (7 seats)	2	2	1	1	1	0
Employment Committee (3 seats)	1	1	1	0	0	0
Service Delivery EAB (12 seats)	4	5	2	1	0	0
Strategy and Resources EAB (12 seats)	4	4	2	1	1	0
Guildford Joint Committee (10 seats)	3	3	2	1	0	1
Joint Appointments Committee (3 seats)	1	1	1	0	0	0
Joint Governance Committee (6 seats)	2	2	1	1	0	0
Licensing Committee (15 seats)	6	5	2	1	0	1
Overview & Scrutiny Committee (12 seats)	4	4	2	1	1	0
Planning Committee (15 seats)	5	5	3	1	1	0
Total no. of seats on committees	32	32	17	8	4	2

CO39 APPOINTMENT OF JOINT STRATEGIC DIRECTORS AND A SECTION 151 OFFICER

Councillors noted that, in July and August 2021, Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils had considered options for collaboration and had agreed to put in place governance arrangements for the partnership, and to create a Joint Management Team (JMT) comprising Chief Executive, Directors and Heads of Service. A Joint Appointments Committee (JAC) of three councillors from each council was established and in November 2021, both councils appointed Tom Horwood as the Joint Chief Executive. The next phase of the appointment process was being conducted in two stages, Directors and then Heads of Service. The JAC had carried out the first stage of the appointments and had completed a recruitment process to appoint three Joint Strategic Directors.

Although the JAC could undertake and determine all aspects of the process for the appointment of the Joint Directors on behalf of the councils, statutory guidance issued by the Secretary of State under Section 40 of the Localism Act 2011, to which all councils must have regard required that any new senior appointment with a salary package of £100,000 or more required full Council approval. In addition to this, any appointments to the statutory offices of Section 151 Officer or Monitoring Officer must be approved by the Full Councils of both authorities. Therefore, following the assessment process with candidates for the Joint Strategic Director roles the JAC, at its meeting held on 16 June 2022, had recommended the following appointments for confirmation by both councils:

- (a) Ian Doyle
- (b) Dawn Hudd
- (c) Annie Righton

The full Council could only make or approve the appointment where no well-founded objection had been made by the Leader on behalf of the Executive in accordance with the provisions of

Part II of Schedule 1 of the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001. The Leaders had confirmed that no such objection had been made.

Separate to the appointments process, this Council was required to appoint a Section 151 Officer (Chief Finance Officer), in the light of the imminent departure of the current Director of Resources on 31 July. While the next phase of the Joint Management Team progressed, it was proposed that an interim joint appointment be agreed with the current Section 151 Officer within Waverley Borough Council, Graeme Clark to take effect from 1 August 2022.

The Council noted that, at its meeting on 19 July, Waverley Borough Council had also considered this matter and had resolved to appoint Ian Doyle, Dawn Hudd, and Annie Righton to the roles of Joint Strategic Directors.

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

RESOLVED:

(1) To make the appointments of the three Joint Strategic Directors as follows:

- (a) Ian Doyle;
- (b) Dawn Hudd;
- (c) Annie Righton

(2) To appoint Graeme Clark as Section 151 Officer from 1 August 2022.

Reasons for Recommendation:

- (1) To appoint permanent Joint Strategic Directors for Guildford and Waverley Borough Councils.
- (2) To appoint a Section 151 Officer as this is a statutory requirement.

CO40 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 28 April and 26 May 2022.

CO41 COMMON SEAL

The Council

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

The meeting finished at 8.20 pm

Signed

Mayor

Date