

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held at Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on Tuesday 24 July 2018

* Councillor Mike Parsons (Mayor)

* Councillor Richard Billington (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Councillor David Bilbé * Councillor Philip Brooker * Councillor Adrian Chandler * Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield * Councillor Nils Christiansen * Councillor Colin Cross * Councillor Geoff Davis * Councillor Graham Ellwood * Councillor David Elms * Councillor Matt Furniss <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor Andrew Gomm <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor David Goodwin <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor Angela Goodwin * Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr * Councillor Angela Gunning * Councillor Gillian Harwood <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor Liz Hogger * Councillor Christian Holliday * Councillor Liz Hooper * Councillor Mike Hurdle <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor Michael Illman * Councillor Gordon Jackson <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor Jennifer Jordan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Councillor Nigel Kears <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor Sheila Kirkland * Councillor Nigel Manning * Councillor Julia McShane * Councillor Bob McShee * Councillor Marsha Moseley <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor Susan Parker * Councillor Dennis Paul * Councillor Tony Phillips * Councillor Mike Piper * Councillor David Quelch * Councillor Jo Randall * Councillor David Reeve * Councillor Caroline Reeves <li style="padding-left: 20px;">Councillor Iseult Roche * Councillor Tony Rooth * Councillor Matthew Sarti * Councillor Pauline Searle * Councillor Paul Spooner * Councillor James Walsh * Councillor Jenny Wicks * Councillor David Wright |
|---|--|

*Present

Honorary Freemen Andrew Hodges and Jen Powell, and Honorary Alderman Terence Patrick were also in attendance.

CO19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andrew Gomm, Angela Goodwin, David Goodwin, Liz Hogger, Jennifer Jordan, Sheila Kirkland, Nikki Nelson-Smith, Susan Parker, and Iseult Roche, and from Honorary Aldermen K Childs, Mrs C F Cobley, Mrs C F P Griffin, J Marks, B Parke, and L Strudwick.

CO20 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CO21 MINUTES

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 15 May 2018. The Mayor signed the minutes.

CO22 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor informed the Council of two forthcoming events, the first a special evening of Wine Tasting at the Guildhall in aid of Headway Surrey on Thursday 20 September 2018 and the

unveiling of the new War Memorial on Sunday 30 September 2018. Further details of both these events would be circulated by the Civic Secretary in due course.

CO23 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Leader welcomed Councillors Jackson and Manning back to the Executive and announced details of the revised portfolio responsibilities of Executive members for the 2018-19 municipal year, which had been aligned with the revised priorities set out in the new Corporate Plan 2018-2023.

CO24 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No questions or requests to make statements had been received from the public.

CO25 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

(a) Councillor Bob McShee asked the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning, the following question:

"In relation to Agenda item 12 (Capital and Investment Outturn Report 2017-18), I note that there has been a slippage in the capital programme, and looking at the table in paragraph 3.11 on page 171, may I ask the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management:

- (i) why there has been an underspend on the Guildford Park Car Park project?*
- (ii) where the £1.035m has been spent on the SARP project?"*

The Lead Councillor's response was as follows:

"In response to part (i) of your question – reasons for underspend on the Guildford Park redevelopment, I would comment as follows:

- The redevelopment of the surface car park is not only a complex project but the fact it is a brownfield site brings further complications. The requirement to carry out archaeological investigations proved more onerous than had initially been anticipated and delayed the start of the enabling works that are required on this site before the main construction works can start.*
- Added to this, major services running through the site, including a 21 inch high pressure water main along with large BT and Virgin Media cabling are having to be diverted. Unfortunately, it has taken the various utility companies longer to carry out the first phase of the diversionary works than planned. As you may appreciate these works needed to be carried out in a carefully planned and scheduled way to avoid service disruption to both residents and local businesses.*
- I am pleased to be able to let you know that our enabling works contractor will now start to construct a number of retaining structures and rebuild the access road into the site. This work is due to be completed later this year.*
- Our current programme aims to see the construction of the multi-storey car park start early in the New Year*

In response to part (ii) of your question, I would remind councillors that the decision to approve preliminary expenditure on SARP was taken by the Executive on 27 September 2016 following an update on progress on the project and agreement to move towards a

planning application and agreeing Heads of Terms with partners. The expenditure to date has been incurred on carrying out:

- *An Environment Impact Assessment and ground investigation surveys and works which are needed in order to submit a planning application*
- *Producing a masterplan for the site in preparation for outline planning*
- *Technical and feasibility studies and advice for the relocation of the Sewage Treatment Works and design of the new works*
- *Specialist legal, financial and property advice on the viability, funding and legal aspects of the scheme and the various agreements that will be required in order to deliver a complex development such as this*
- *Project management costs*
- *Asbestos removal*

An update on the project and spend to date was presented to the SARP Governance Board in May 2018.”

Councillor Nigel Manning
Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management

- (b) Councillor Bob McShee asked the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance, Councillor Matt Furniss, the following question:

“In relation to Agenda item 17 (Minutes of the Executive - 22 May 2018), and specifically Minute EX6 - Review of Councillor Working Groups (pages 313 and 314), may I ask the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance why there is no Worplesdon ward councillor represented on the SARP Councillor Forum given that part of Slyfield is located in Worplesdon Ward?”

The Lead Councillor’s response was as follows:

“The SARP Councillor Forum membership is made up of the following councillors:

*Cllr Furniss
Cllr Spooner
Cllr Brooker
Cllr Quelch
Cllr McShane
Cllr Gunning
Cllr Walsh*

Membership involves the relevant portfolio holders in infrastructure, planning, and housing and is cross party including the ward members from Stoke where the majority of the development is planned.”

Councillor Matt Furniss
Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance

In a supplementary question, Councillor McShee asked the Lead Councillor to explain why there were councillors from Westborough, Merrow, and Stoughton on the Forum but no councillors from Burpham or Worplesdon?

The Lead Councillor responded by stating that the Forum was cross-party and if councillors from Burpham and Worplesdon were also represented the Forum would

comprise of predominantly the majority party. The Lead Councillor indicated that he would review the membership again in May 2019.

- (c) Councillor Colin Cross asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the following question:

“Will the Leader of the Council express this Council’s written concern and disappointment at the recently announced SCC decision to close Ripley C of E Primary School as of this week?”

This decision to close a rural school that has operated since 1840 is a massive blow to the local community who were recently consulted and voted 97% against closure. It is also clear that, in spite of SCC Education being given the latest GBC Local Plan Housing figures for Lovelace and Send wards and the news that the GBC Plan was found to be sound by the Inspector, they have chosen to deliberately ignore these revised figures and use obsolete numbers that vastly underestimate the population growth. Why? We have been offered no reason other than ‘They may not get built’.”

The Leader’s response was as follows:

“I too was very disappointed to hear of the closure of Ripley C of E Primary School.

This Council is not the Education authority but we do provide Surrey County Council with an annual update on the number of houses likely to be completed over the next 10 years and we provided this updated information, including those sites within the emerging Local Plan, for the County Council to take into account in its deliberations. In considering the future of the school, the County Council commented that:

- *There are currently 38 children on roll, 29 of whom are in years Reception to 5 and would therefore require an alternative primary school place in September. Around half of those are from the village of Ripley, whilst the majority of other children live closer to other schools.*
- *For future cohorts, current projections for school places indicate there is not an immediate need to re-provide places that would be lost by the discontinuance of the school. The local authority will monitor the projected need for future school places and propose changes if required to ensure sufficient places are available.*

The County Council is therefore satisfied that suitable alternative education provision can be provided locally. We will continue to provide accurate updates in relation to housing development across the borough to enable the County to make well informed decisions.”

Councillor Paul Spooner
Leader of the Council

CO26 REVIEW OF ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES 2018-19

The Council received the report of the Democratic Services Manager on the review of the allocation of seats on committees consequent upon Councillor Tony Rooth’s resignation from the Conservative Group on 23 May 2018. Councillor Rooth was now an independent member.

The political balance on the Council was now:

Conservatives: 33
 Liberal Democrats: 9
 Guildford Greenbelt Group: 3
 Labour: 2
 Independent: 1

Councillor Rooth was currently a full member of the Planning Committee, Overview and Scrutiny Committee, and the Society, Environment, and Council Development EAB; and a substitute member of the Borough, Economy and Infrastructure EAB. These appointments had been approved by the Council on 15 May 2018 when Councillor Rooth was still a member of the Conservative group.

This report dealt with the review and proposed two options for a revised numerical allocation of seats on committees for consideration by the Council.

The Council noted that, under the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990 (as amended), there was no strict entitlement calculation applicable to councillors who were not members of a political group. However, following the calculations and allocation of seats to political groups, the Council could exercise its discretion by appointing the non-grouped member to any seats not otherwise allocated, provided that no councillor votes against the proposal.

The Council agreed to take a recorded vote in respect of the options being proposed.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, proposed, and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner seconded, the adoption of the following motion:

- (1) That the Council votes on Option A, as set out on page 38 of the Council agenda, the effect of which is to re-appoint Councillor Tony Rooth to the Planning Committee and Overview and Scrutiny Committee and remove him from membership of the Society EAB.

The Council noted that if, following the recorded vote on Option A, there were no dissenters, the numerical allocation of seats on committees for 2018-19 set out in Option A would be adopted, and Option B below would fall. If there were dissenters, the Council would proceed to vote on Option B. If there was a majority in favour, but there were a number of abstentions, but no dissenters, Option A would be adopted.

- (2) That the Council votes on Option B, as set out on page 39 of the Council agenda, the effect of which is to remove Councillor Tony Rooth from the Planning Committee and re-appoint him to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Society EAB.

The Council noted that if, following the recorded vote on Option B, there were no dissenters, the numerical allocation of seats on committees for 2018-19 set out in Option B would be adopted. If there was a majority in favour, but there were a number of abstentions, but no dissenters, Option B would be adopted. If there were dissenters, the Council could vote on an alternative proposal to allocate seat(s) on committees to Councillor Rooth, provided there were no dissenters.

Following the debate on the motion, Councillor Tony Rooth proposed, and Councillor Angela Gunning seconded, an amendment to Option B, the effect of which would be to re-appoint Councillor Rooth to the Planning Committee and to remove him from membership of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the Society EAB.

Following the debate on the amendment, Councillor Rooth, with the consent of his seconder and the meeting, withdrew his amendment.

The Council then proceeded to take a recorded vote on Option A, which was lost in view of four councillors dissenting. The result of the recorded vote on that option was as follows:

FOR:

Councillor David Bilbé
 Councillor Richard Billington
 Councillor Philip Brooker
 Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield
 Councillor Nils Christiansen
 Councillor Colin Cross
 Councillor David Elms
 Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr.
 Councillor Angela Gunning
 Councillor Gillian Harwood
 Councillor Christian Holliday
 Councillor Liz Hooper
 Councillor Mike Hurdle
 Councillor Gordon Jackson
 Councillor Julia McShane
 Councillor Bob McShee
 Councillor Dennis Paul
 Councillor Tony Phillips
 Councillor Mike Piper
 Councillor David Quelch
 Councillor David Reeve
 Councillor Caroline Reeves
 Councillor Tony Rooth
 Councillor Matt Sarti
 Councillor Pauline Searle
 Councillor Paul Spooner
 Councillor James Walsh
 Councillor Jenny Wicks

AGAINST:

Councillor Graham Ellwood
 Councillor Matt Furniss
 Councillor Nigel Manning
 Councillor Jo Randall

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Adrian Chandler
 Councillor Geoff Davis
 Councillor Nigel Kearse
 Councillor Marsha Moseley
 Councillor Mike Parsons

The Council then proceeded to take a recorded vote on Option B, which was lost in view of one councillor dissenting. The result of the recorded vote on that option was as follows:

FOR:

Councillor David Bilbé
 Councillor Philip Brooker
 Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield
 Councillor Colin Cross
 Councillor Geoff Davis
 Councillor Graham Ellwood
 Councillor David Elms
 Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr.
 Councillor Angela Gunning
 Councillor Gillian Harwood
 Councillor Christian Holliday
 Councillor Liz Hooper
 Councillor Mike Hurdle
 Councillor Gordon Jackson
 Councillor Nigel Manning
 Councillor Bob McShee
 Councillor Marsha Moseley
 Councillor Dennis Paul
 Councillor Tony Phillips
 Councillor Mike Piper
 Councillor David Quelch
 Councillor Jo Randall
 Councillor David Reeve
 Councillor Caroline Reeves
 Councillor Matt Sarti

AGAINST:

Councillor Julia McShane

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Richard Billington
 Councillor Adrian Chandler
 Councillor Nils Christiansen
 Councillor Matt Furniss
 Councillor Nigel Kearse
 Councillor Mike Parsons
 Councillor Tony Rooth

FOR:

Councillor Pauline Searle
 Councillor Paul Spooner
 Councillor James Walsh
 Councillor Jenny Wicks

AGAINST:**ABSTAIN:**

The Mayor proposed, and the Deputy Mayor seconded the adoption of the numerical allocation of seats on committees, as set out in Appendix 2 to the Order Paper, the effect of which would be to remove Councillor Tony Rooth from membership of all committees and leave one vacancy on the Borough, Economy, and Infrastructure EAB. The motion was put to the vote and was lost.

The Mayor adjourned the meeting to allow officers to consider the implications of the voting on this matter.

Upon the resumption of the meeting, the Democratic Services Manager confirmed that, as the Council had voted against the numerical allocation of seats referred to in Appendix 2 to the Order Paper, the allocation of seats would default to the position referred to in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, which was the numerical allocation of seats on committees as agreed by the Council on 15 May 2018.

The effect of this was to remove Councillor Rooth from the committees of which he had hitherto been a member, as his seats on those committees had been allocated to the Conservative group. It was now a matter for the Conservative group leader to appoint, on behalf of his group, councillors to those committees in place of Councillor Rooth.

CO27 EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARDS - PROPOSED REVISED REMITS TO REFLECT CORPORATE PLAN THEMES

The Council noted that the remit of each Executive Advisory Board (EAB) was aligned to themes in the Council's Corporate Plan and set out in their Terms of Reference. As reported at the Selection meeting of Council held on 15 May 2018, it was now necessary to review the remits of the EABs to reflect the three fundamental themes of Place-Making, Community and Innovation, which underpin the newly adopted Corporate Plan 2018-2023.

The Council was therefore invited to consider changes to the names of the two EABs and their respective remits to reflect the three fundamental themes of the new Corporate Plan.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by Councillor Adrian Chandler, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Borough, Economy, and Infrastructure EAB be re-named the Place-Making and Innovation EAB.
- (2) That the Society, Environment, and Council Development EAB be re-named the Community EAB.

Reason:

To enable the remits of the two EABs to be amended to align with the three themes of the new Corporate Plan 2018-2023.

CO28 ADOPTION OF EAST HORSLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Councillors were reminded that neighbourhood plans were statutory development plans produced by parish/town councils or neighbourhood forums. The Council considered a report on the East

Horsley Neighbourhood Plan, which had been produced by East Horsley Parish Council for the East Horsley Neighbourhood Area (East Horsley parish).

To meet the requirements of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ("the Regulations"), the Council subjected the Plan to a six-week consultation and an examination, after which the Plan was amended in line with the recommendations of the examiner. The Plan was then the subject of a referendum of qualifying voters within the neighbourhood area on 17 May 2018. A majority voted to accept the plan.

By virtue of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the Regulations, the Council must make (adopt) the Plan as soon as reasonably practicable after the referendum is held and, in any event, not later than the last day of the period of 8 weeks from the day after the referendum.

The Council did not need to make the neighbourhood plan if it considered that to do so would be a breach, or would otherwise be incompatible with, any EU or human rights obligations. Officers were of the view that making the Plan would not breach those obligations and that the Council must therefore decide whether or not to make the Plan.

Under recent changes to the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017, the Plan formed part of the statutory development plan and carried full weight in planning decisions as soon as it was approved at a referendum, rather than when it was made. Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, seconded by Councillor Matt Sarti, the Council

RESOLVED: That the Council approves the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan.

Reason:

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

CO29 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEWS: EAST & WEST CLANDON PARISH COUNCILS

The Council considered a detailed report on requests from East Clandon Parish Council and West Clandon Parish Council to conduct community governance reviews of those parishes. A Community Governance Review (CGR) was undertaken by the principal council for the area (i.e. this Council) and was a review of the whole or part of the Borough to consider one or more of the following:

- Creating, merging, altering or abolishing parishes;
- The naming of parishes and the style (i.e. whether to call it a town council or village council etc.) of new parishes;
- The electoral arrangements for parishes (including the number of councillors to be elected to the council, and parish warding), and
- Grouping parishes under a common parish council or de-grouping parishes

The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 had set down the legal framework within which principal councils must undertake such reviews.

The Council noted that, on 17 May 2018, East Clandon Parish Council formally requested a CGR to increase the number of parish councillors from 5 to 6 for the following reasons:

- (a) to help with capacity in terms of demands;
- (b) to maintain a quorum for meetings; and
- (c) for succession planning purposes as it had several long standing councillors.

On 14 June 2018, the Council also received a request from West Clandon Parish Council for a CGR to increase the number of parish councillors from 6 to 8 for the following reasons:

- (a) This would better enable the Parish Council to cover the range of responsibilities taken on by councillors.
- (b) It would make it easier to achieve a quorum - this was sometimes an issue given the extensive community, business and professional interests of West Clandon residents.
- (c) It would also enable the Parish Council to be more inclusive in drawing representation from more sections of the West Clandon community.

The Council was asked to approve the proposed terms of reference in respect of each proposed CGR, as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 to the report submitted to the Council, together with the proposed timetable for each review. The draft terms of reference for each CGR included the matters on which the public would be consulted, as required by the 2007 Act, namely:

- (1) the respective requests from the two parish councils to increase the number of parish councillors as outlined above;
- (2) whether there should be any change to the year in which elections to the parish councils are held (currently every four years with next elections due in May 2019); and
- (3) whether the parish councils should be divided into wards for the purpose of electing parish councillors and, if so, the name, number and boundaries of any such wards, and the number of parish councillors to be elected for such wards.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by Councillor Jenny Wicks, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That community governance reviews of both East and West Clandon parishes be conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, as described in the report submitted to the Council.
- (2) That the terms of reference in respect of those community governance reviews including the proposed timetables, as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 to the report, be approved and published.
- (3) That the Democratic Services Manager be authorised to conduct the community governance reviews on the Council's behalf and to take all necessary action to comply with the Council's statutory obligations in that regard.

Reason:

To ensure 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.

CO30 CAPITAL AND INVESTMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2017-18

Following the adoption of the new capital and investment strategy for 2018-19, the Council noted that the annual treasury management report now encompassed capital and non-treasury

investments. The amended format met the requirements of the revised Prudential and Treasury Codes of Practice and the Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government (MHCLG) updated Investment Guidance.

The Council considered the report in its revised format, which had included:

- a summary of the economic factors affecting the approved strategy and counterparty update
- a summary of the approved strategy for 2017-18
- a summary of the treasury management activity for 2017-18
- details of compliance with the treasury and prudential indicators
- non-treasury investments
- the capital programme
- risks and performance
- Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP)
- details of external service providers
- details of training

The Council was informed that total expenditure on the General Fund capital programme in 2017-18 had been £13.9 million, which was less than the revised budget by £20.2 million. Details of the revised estimate and actual expenditure in the year for each scheme were set out in Appendix 3 to the report. Although the budget for Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) had been £1.229 million, the outturn had been £573,852, due to slippage in the capital programme in 2016-17.

Councillors noted that the Council's investment property portfolio stood at £147.4 million as at 31 March 2018. Rental income had been £9.17 million, and income return was 6.59% against the benchmark of 4.2%.

The Council's cash balances had built up over a number of years, and reflected the strong balance sheet, with considerable revenue and capital reserves. Officers carried out the treasury function within the parameters set by the Council each year in the Capital and Investment Strategy. As at 31 March 2018, the Council held £133.6 million in investments, of which £43.5 million was short term borrowing.

Longer-term borrowing was undertaken in line with the Council's liability benchmark and the capital programme. The Council had £241.6 million of borrowing at 31 March 2018, of which £43.5 million was short-term borrowing for cash purposes.

The report had confirmed that the Council had complied with its prudential indicators, treasury management policy statement, and treasury management practices (TMPs) for 2017-18.

The Council noted that the slippage in the capital programme had resulted in a lower Capital Financing Requirement than estimated. Interest paid on debt had been lower than budget, due to the variable loan rate being reset lower than expected.

The yield returned on investments had been lower than estimated, but the interest received was higher due to more cash being available to invest in the year – a direct result of the capital programme slippage.

The report had also been considered by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee and Executive at their respective meetings held on 14 and 19 June 2018, and both and endorsed the recommendation in the report.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Capital and Investment Outturn Report for 2017-18 be noted.
- (2) That the actual prudential indicators reported for 2017-18, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

Reason:

To comply with the Council's treasury management policy statement, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Code of Practice on treasury management and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities.

CO31 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT

The Council considered a report which outlined the work undertaken by overview and scrutiny during the past year and, within Appendix 1 to the report, its future work programme as thus far developed. The report also included proposed measures to develop overview and scrutiny further, principally through greater involvement by residents in overview and scrutiny.

Decisions taken under the 'urgency' provisions and the use of 'call-in' were detailed within the report. In 2017-18, three decisions were taken under the urgency provisions of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules, and there were no call-ins.

The report had also been considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 10 July 2018, and the Committee had commended it to Council, including a proposal to present Overview and Scrutiny reports to full Council.

Upon the motion of Councillor Caroline Reeves, seconded by Councillor James Walsh, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the report be commended as the annual report of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for 2017-18.
- (2) That the current rules relating to call in or urgency provisions remain unchanged.
- (3) That measures be enacted to develop Overview and Scrutiny further, including public involvement in work programming, co-option, improved publicity, and more innovative means of scrutiny.
- (4) That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee hold the power to refer its formal recommendations and conclusions for consideration at Full Council, with the Executive response reported to a subsequent Full Council meeting within two months.

Reasons:

- The Council's Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 17(i), requires 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.

- Article 8.2(d) of the Council's Constitution requires 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.
- Proposals are put forward to ensure the continued development of Overview and Scrutiny.

CO32 REVIEW OF ARRANGEMENTS FOR DEALING WITH MISCONDUCT AGAINST COUNCILLORS

The Council considered a report on the outcome of a review of the Arrangements for Dealing with Allegations of Misconduct by Councillors and Co-Opted Members ("Arrangements") by the Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer.

The review had focused on correcting inconsistencies, contradictions, and vague drafting in the predecessor document, and on refining processes which were found to cause uncertainty and delay. The review had also rationalised and restated the sanctions available to the Hearings Sub-Committee.

The report and the draft revised Arrangements had been considered by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee at its meeting on 14 June 2018. Subject to a number of comments, the Committee had commended the revised Arrangements for adoption by the Council.

The Monitoring Officer had met with the parish representatives and the independent member on the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee to go through the proposed revised Arrangements to identify changes that affected parish councillors, on Wednesday 18 July (after publication of the agenda for the Council meeting). Consequently, a number of revisions had been made to the Draft revised Arrangements, details of which were set out in Appendix 3 to the Order Paper.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington, the Council

RESOLVED: That the revised Arrangements for Dealing with Allegations of Misconduct by Councillors and Co-Opted Members, as shown in the corrected version set out in Appendix 3 to the Order Paper circulated at the meeting, be adopted.

Reason:

To promote effective and clear arrangements for dealing with allegations of misconduct, and a clearly stated suite of sanctions.

CO33 PROPOSED GUILDFORD JOINT COMMITTEE

The Council considered a report on the relative merits of replacing the current Local Committee (Guildford) with a new Guildford Joint Committee, which would deal not only with the range of County Council functions that the Local Committee currently discharged locally, but also a range of Borough Council functions delegated to it.

At its meeting on 19 June 2018, the Executive had also considered a report on this matter and had approved the proposal in terms of the principle of establishing a Guildford Joint Committee in place of the current Local Committee arrangements and the various executive functions to be delegated to it. The Executive had also agreed that the Draft Constitution of the Joint Committee should include a mix of executive and (subject to the Council's approval) non-executive functions, as this would enable the Borough Council membership on the Joint

Committee to be politically balanced and comprise a mix of executive and non-executive councillors.

Upon the motion of the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, seconded by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the Council agrees to establish, with Surrey County Council, a Guildford Joint Committee, to replace the current Local Committee arrangements, to take effect from 19 September 2018.
- (2) That, subject to paragraph (3) below, the Draft Constitution, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, including the proposed non executive functions of the Council to be delegated to the Joint Committee, and the standing orders under which the Joint Committee will operate, be approved.
- (3) That the Managing Director be authorised, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance, to agree any necessary minor changes to the Constitution of the Joint Committee.
- (4) That the numerical allocation of Borough Council seats on the Joint Committee to political groups, as shown in Appendix 2 to the report, be approved.
- (5) That the following nominations for appointment of Borough Council members to the Guildford Joint Committee, for the remainder of the 2018-19 municipal year, be approved:
 - Councillor David Bilbé
 - Councillor Nils Christiansen
 - Councillor Nigel Kears
 - Councillor Julia McShane
 - Councillor Tony Phillips
 - Councillor Mike Piper
 - Councillor Jo Randall
 - Councillor David Reeve
 - Councillor Matt Sarti
 - Councillor Paul Spooner
 - Councillor David Wright
- (6) That the Council appoints the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner as Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee for the 2018-19 Municipal Year.
- (7) That the Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer be authorised, in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance, to make all necessary consequential amendments to the Council's Constitution.
- (8) That the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel be requested to consider as part of the full review of councillors' allowances scheduled for 2019, whether any Special Responsibility Allowance should be payable to the chairman (or vice-chairman) of the Joint Committee whenever that role is undertaken by a borough councillor.
- (9) That the Joint Committee arrangements be reviewed after 12 months' operation.

Reason:

To establish a true partnership between Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Council, with shared decision making and joined-up working.

CO34 TIMETABLE OF COUNCIL AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS 2019-20

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the Council

RESOLVED: That the proposed timetable of Council and Committee meetings for the 2019-20 municipal year, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be approved.

Reason:

To assist with the preparation of individual committee work programmes and new councillor induction programme following the Borough Council elections in May 2019.

CO35 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 24 April, 22 May, and 19 June 2018.

CO36 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 9.10pm

Signed
Mayor

Date