

## GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of Guildford Borough Council held at Council Chamber, Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB on Tuesday 9 October, 2018

\* Councillor Mike Parsons (Mayor)

\* Councillor Richard Billington (Deputy Mayor)

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

\*Present

### **CO37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Graham Ellwood, David Elms, Liz Hooper, Michael Illman, Nigel Kears, Dennis Paul, and Matt Sarti, and from Honorary Freeman Jen Powell and Honorary Aldermen Mrs C F Cobley, Sarah Creedy, Mrs C F P Griffin, J Marks, B Parke, and L Strudwick.

### **CO38 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

There were no disclosures of interest.

### **CO39 MINUTES**

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 24 July 2018, subject to the correction on page 1 of the agenda to show that the Mayor and Deputy Mayor were Councillors Mike Parsons and Richard Billington respectively, and that the minute number range should be CO19 to CO36 rather than CO20 to CO37. The Mayor signed the minutes as corrected.

**CO40 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS**Royal British Legion Poppy Appeal

The Mayor referred councillors to his recent request for help with this year's Royal British Legion Poppy Appeal by sparing an hour to sell poppies in the High Street on Saturday 3 November 2018.

Guildford Young Carers Fund

The Mayor was delighted to announce that The County Club had selected the Guildford Young Carers Fund as their charitable cause for 2019.

Guildford Community Lottery

The Mayor reminded councillors that the first Guildford Lottery draw would take place on 1 December 2018, with tickets going on sale from 30 October.

**CO41 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS**

The Leader commented on the following matters:

- (a) The Executive would be submitting its comments on the public consultation on the Main Modifications to the Submission Local Plan by the end of the week, and these would be published on the Council's website.
- (b) The announcement at the Conservative Party Conference of the removal of the HRA borrowing cap to enable the development of social housing.

**CO42 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

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

**CO43 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS**

- (a) Councillor Susan Parker asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the following question:

"In view of the publication of the housing need statistics by the Office of National Statistics, which indicate a demographic need for Guildford of 301 homes per year, would the Leader of the Council please make arrangements for the Council to review the Local Plan and amend it in order to reflect this new information? It is understood that this may require dialogue with the Inspector, but during the Examination in Public the publication of this information, and the need for consequential change, was discussed, acknowledged and agreed. Can we therefore act accordingly?"

The Leader of the Council's response was as follows:

"Regarding arriving at a figure for the Borough's Housing need, it is important to distinguish between methods for establishing this need and which of the two is applicable to Guildford's Submitted Local Plan:

1. The first method is based on establishing need under the transitional provisions of the NPPF (or old methodology), which is the basis upon which the Local Plan was submitted and is being examined;
2. The second is based on establishing need according to Government's new standard method for calculating housing need, which does not apply to the submitted Local Plan.

The new household projection figures, released by ONS are of course relevant to consider in both circumstances as they result in a lower demographic starting point for calculating housing need, but would not necessarily feed through to the same housing need figure due to the variance in approaches. It would thus be grossly unfair to claim that the housing need figure that we put forward in our submission Local Plan was wrong, by quoting a different need figure, which relies on a totally different methodology – a methodology that is increasingly being called into question.

You will remember GBC had chosen to progress the plan making use of the transition provisions, i.e. using the old methodology in part because the proposed new methodology was predicting an OAN figure of 752, which was significantly higher than the 654 contained in the submission plan.

The issue being raised now is, given the latest household projections and applying Government's new standard method, Guildford's OAN would fall to 431. Therefore, the argument runs it is beneficial to Guildford to apply the standard method and not the old methodology under the transitional provisions of the NPPF, as this will reduce the need to allocate so much residential development in the green belt.

As ever with OAN, the situation is not straightforward.

First, with regard to the emerging Local Plan, GBC are reviewing the implications of the projections for housing need under the old methodology. In this regard, the inspector has offered 'the Council an opportunity to comment on the latest version of the Household Projections and their implication for OAN. The related population projections were of course discussed in the hearings.' GL Hearn are currently considering the implications of these insofar as they relate to the old methodology however their initial thoughts are that they do not result in a significant change to the figures. Our formal response is expected by 17 October.

Second, and wholly separate from the Inspector's considerations, GBC is seeking to establish greater clarity on the Government's new standard method and the potential for changes to this method and hence the calculation of housing need. There is significant uncertainty around the new figures. A recent statement by the Minister included the following:

*"We are having a very rapid look at this rather unexpected result from the ONS. It has caused some very anomalous results. There's some strong growth areas of the country that now have a zero housing need which is patently obviously incorrect....."*

*We are looking at some data on the increase in the number of people staying at home to see whether that artificial constraint means we should look at the numbers again....."*

*We are hoping to make a rapid announcement about that because [councils] are doing the maths and saying 'I'm off the hook..."*

*This is a projection forward of household formation, not a reflection of previous demand which has been thus far unmet."*

The Minister has also been quoted as saying that he has "concerns" about the new projections' implications for housing need figures because they "don't recognise pent-up demand".

There is therefore an indication that Government's new standard method will be amended and in such a way to have regard to suppressed household formation. This is highly likely

to increase the figure required within Guildford. Whilst this may not increase it to the extent of the previous figure calculated under the standard method (752), it remains unclear whether it will be higher or lower than the figure being considered by the Inspector under the transitional provisions of the NPPF.

It would therefore be premature to halt the progress of the Local Plan until there is clear confirmation that, based on an amended new standard method, the resulting figure is notably lower than that being considered by the Inspector at present. If and when the standard method is confirmed, the Council will be in a position to consider its implications for the emerging plan that is undergoing main modifications consultation. Whatever these implications are, we are convinced that progress with the Local Plan to date and the weight it carries is a critical step in supporting our desire to address the backlog in delivery of the homes we so desperately need in the borough, particularly in the early years following its adoption. This will occur in a sustainable manner, which includes the provision of supporting transport and other vital infrastructure.

Whilst this level of uncertainty exists, we would encourage people to engage in the consultation process on proposed main modifications including our housing requirement. The Inspector will consider all duly made representations and it will be up to him to convene further public hearing sessions, if he considers them necessary”.

Councillor Paul Spooner  
Leader of the Council

- (b) Councillor Tony Rooth asked the Lead Councillor for Enterprise and Economic Development, Councillor David Bilbé, the following question:

“May I ask the Lead Councillor for Enterprise and Economic Development, as a follow-up to the question I asked him at the Council meeting on 10 April 2018, for an update on the following matters in relation to the Village project:

- (i) details of the sale/disposal and removal of the containers,
- (ii) clarification of any ongoing business rates liability,
- (iii) final costs associated with the disconnection, capping of services,
- (iv) details of supplementary estimates approved,
- (v) whether any further consideration had been given to possible temporary uses of the site rather than it just standing empty as a town centre wasteland, for example, temporary parking for public service vehicles (such as Police vehicles), residents’ parking and additional visitor parking over the forthcoming Christmas and New Year periods, or temporary use for homeless or other disadvantaged people,
- (vi) whether the Council continues to pay any rent or expenses to the site owners and, if so, how much, together with details of other ongoing expenditure?”

The Lead Councillor’s response to parts (i) to (vi) of the question was as follows:

- (i) The containers were sold to Bootle Containers Ltd for £134,400 plus VAT, and subsequently removed on 15/16 May 2018.
- (ii) All business rates liability ceased on 16 May 2018
- (iii) £15,728 including all clearance costs. Original budgeted estimate was £50,000.
- (iv) On 28 November 2017, the Executive approved the following:

- A reduction in the 2017-18 income budget of £376,280 by viring the budget from external interest.
  - An increase in the Village expenditure budget for 2017-18 of £254,762 to cover the projected Village costs for 2017-18 by viring the budget from the Minimum Revenue Provision budget.
- (v) Parking was considered, but costs of making the land good for this purpose and installation of associated technology were too high; site owners would also have needed to agree a change of use from the intended retail village.
- (vi) No rent has been paid now or at any stage as the site was made available free of charge by its owners.

Councillor David Bilbé  
Lead Councillor for Enterprise and Economic Development

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

“Please could the Leader report on our partnership with Dongying and why you chose to partner Guildford with an industrial city based on the second largest Chinese oilfield and one of the world’s lead producers of rubber tyres?”

The Leader of the Council’s response was as follows:

“I would refer Councillor McShee to the report to the meeting of the Council on 10 October 2017 which approved the signing of the partnership agreement with Dongying. This emphasised the potential benefits of partnerships between British and Chinese towns and cities in terms of trade, investment and through the exchange of knowledge and ideas. Existing links developed by the University of Surrey gave us a particular opportunity to develop a relationship with Dongying.

Building on the visit to Dongying and Beijing, we are exploring how we can deliver economic benefits from the relationship and capitalise on contacts made to identify opportunities for both inward investment and export that would benefit not only the local economy, but also the wider economic area. Discussions will include the possible establishment of a trade office in Guildford. Sectors of focus would include oil and gas (where both historically and currently Guildford and Woking still have a number of companies operating in international markets), agricultural technologies and creative industries including gaming - China being one of the most important markets for the sale of video games in the world.

The University of Surrey has recently demonstrated the value of cooperation with its Chinese counterparts by winning the prestigious “Visual Object Tracking” competition in partnership with Jiangnan University. The algorithm that they developed to track objects in video was described as one of the most advanced in the world and is an important feature of many AI applications, such as visual surveillance, autonomous navigation and robotics. It is important that we continue to support the University of Surrey in forging new relationships that continue to place Guildford at the forefront of ground-breaking technological innovation”.

Councillor Paul Spooner  
Leader of the Council

- (d) Councillor Tony Rooth asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the following question:

"In view of a revised forecast for Guildford borough's population growth, issued by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) in September 2018, which contains a substantial projected reduction in housing need target to 431, does the Leader of the Council consider:

- (i) that the submission Local Plan will require change, potentially major modification and amendment followed by further public consultation, if the final housing need figure is substantially below the figure used in the modified Local Plan currently out for public consultation;
- (ii) whether it would be in Guildford's interest to adopt the standard method used in the latest ONS figures as the base for calculating housing need;
- (iii) that, pending resolution of the figure for Guildford's housing need, the existing main modifications, specifically MM 39, policy A61 - the potential development of 200 homes at Aaron's Hill, Godalming should be withdrawn from the Submission Local Plan?"

The Leader of the Council's response to parts (i) to (iii) of the question was as follows:

- (i) This is answered in the response to Councillor Parker's question above.
- (ii) This is also answered in the response to Councillor Parker's question. However, Guildford's interest is in adopting a Local Plan that meets our housing need, in the most sustainable way, which includes the delivery of necessary supporting infrastructure, and with a focus on affordable homes. Alongside this, we must achieve an appropriate balance between housing, employment and retail needs, whilst protecting the heritage and character of our borough. The actions that are outlined above will help to inform how best to achieve these aims.
- (iii) Due to the consultation being in progress, it is not possible to comment further around any potential modifications to the Local Plan. Further modifications in order to make the plan sound would be recommended by the Inspector. Nevertheless, clearly this question cannot be answered in the absence of answers to the first two questions, the responses to which have already been outlined"

Councillor Paul Spooner  
Leader of the Council

- (e) Councillor Nils Christiansen asked the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, the following question:

"It states in the 22 May 2018 report to the Executive on the Walnut Bridge Replacement Project that:

*"The Council has an approved budget of £3.341 million for the replacement Walnut Bridge (capital scheme P5/PR354), of which £1.535 million is to be funded by grant from Enterprise M3 LEP. As at 31 March 2018, the Council has spent £896,000 on land acquisition, preliminary works, detailed design work and procurement. The Council has drawn down £926,000 in grant from the LEP to fund this work. The period of the grant was 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2020 and the terms and conditions of the grant provide a number of milestones, which the Council has to meet.*

*A key milestone is that the construction work on the bridge has to commence by 31 January 2019."*

The Executive report of 28 August 2018 then states that costs to date had reached £1,024,737. My questions are:

- (i) How much of the LEP grant has now been drawn down?
- (ii) Are there any circumstances under which the grant monies could become repayable?
- (iii) What would happen if a 'key milestone' were not met?
- (iv) Please can you provide an analysis of what the £1,024,737 was spent on with comparison to budget?

The Lead Councillor's response to parts (i) to (iv) of the question was as follows:

- (i) £926,000
- (ii) Yes. The grant would be repayable if we do not build the Bridge. The grant agreement is 28 pages long but, in summary, the grant may be withheld, suspended or repayment required where:
  - The recipient uses the grant for a purpose other than the one for which it is awarded
  - The delivery of the project does not start within 6 months of the commencement date of the grant agreement
  - The funder considers that the recipient has not made satisfactory progress with the delivery of the project
  - The recipient obtains funding from a third party
  - The recipient provides the funder with any materially misleading or inaccurate information
  - The recipient fails to comply with the reporting and monitoring arrangements of the agreement
  - The recipient fails to comply with the terms and conditions set out in the agreement
  - Bankruptcy, insolvency, receivership, administration or liquidation for the recipient
- (iii) See answer to part (ii) of the question above.
- (iv) This is broken down as follows:
 

Salaries:	£162,886 (engineers and major projects)
Construction:	£91,820 (preliminaries)
Professional Fees:	£641,808 - broken down as follows:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £526,301 design and engineering consultancy work</li> <li>• £39,518 pre-commencement project management</li> <li>• £36,306 legal fees</li> <li>• £27,507 Procurement</li> <li>• £12,176 valuation/surveyor fees</li> </ul>
Land Purchase:	£120,000
Other:	£8,223 (planning fees, D&B checks etc.)

Councillor Matt Furniss  
Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance

**CO44 EXECUTIVE ADVISORY BOARDS - PROPOSED REVIEW OF STRUCTURE AND REMIT**

The Council was reminded 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 held on 15 May 2018, the Council had agreed that it was necessary to review the remits of the EABs to reflect the three fundamental themes of Place-Making, Community, and Innovation, which formed the basis of the newly adopted Corporate Plan 2018-2023 and which differed from those in the previous Corporate Plan. Accordingly, on 24 July 2018, the Council considered a report on proposed changes to the names and remits of the EABs and had agreed that the Borough, Economy and Infrastructure EAB be renamed the Place-making and Innovation EAB and the Society, Environment and Council Development EAB be renamed the Community EAB. The Terms of Reference of the EABs were amended to reflect the changes.

That report had also advised that officers would be drawing together options, including the merits of a single EAB going forward, for consideration by the Council at this meeting in the light of feedback from the Local Government Association (LGA) corporate peer review in December 2017 and the Council's governance reviews in recent years.

The Council considered a report on those options, which were as follows:

1. To disband the existing EABs and establish one overarching EAB making greater use of existing powers to establish task groups to look at specific issues and projects relating to the delivery of the nine strategic Corporate Plan priorities.
2. To disband the existing EABs and establish topic based advisory boards to be commissioned directly by the Executive as and when required.
3. To make no change to the current arrangements.

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:

“That, before any decision is taken in respect of the future of the Executive Advisory Boards, the Council agrees to establish a cross party task and finish group of nine councillors, comprising five Conservative councillors and one councillor from each of the other four groups, whose terms of reference shall be:

- (a) to review the existing governance arrangements in relation to the Executive Advisory Boards and to discuss available options to improve those arrangements, including the proposal for a single Executive Advisory Board; and following that review
- (b) to make recommendations as appropriate to the Council at its meeting on 6 February 2019.”

Following the debate on the motion, Councillor David Goodwin proposed, and Councillor Angela Gunning seconded the following amendment:



Substitute “*eight councillors*” in place of “*nine councillors, comprising five Conservative councillors and one councillor from each of the other four groups*”. The motion, as amended, would read as follows:

“That, before any decision is taken in respect of the future of the Executive Advisory Boards, the Council agrees to establish a cross party task and finish group of eight councillors, whose terms of reference shall be:

- (a) to review the existing governance arrangements in relation to the Executive Advisory Boards and to discuss available options to improve those arrangements, including the proposal for a single Executive Advisory Board; and following that review
- (b) to make recommendations as appropriate to the Council at its meeting on 6 February 2019.”

Following the debate on the amendment, it was put to the vote and was lost.

In considering the original motion, the Council

RESOLVED:

That, before any decision is taken in respect of the future of the Executive Advisory Boards, the Council agrees to establish a cross party task and finish group of nine councillors, comprising five Conservative councillors and one councillor from each of the other four groups, whose terms of reference shall be:

- (a) to review the existing governance arrangements in relation to the Executive Advisory Boards and to discuss available options to improve those arrangements, including the proposal for a single Executive Advisory Board; and following that review
- (b) to make recommendations as appropriate to the Council at its meeting on 6 February 2019.

#### **CO45 REVIEW OF ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COMMITTEES: 2018-19**

The Council received the report of the proper officer (Democratic Services Manager) on the review of the allocation of seats on committees consequent upon Councillor Bob McShee’s resignation from the Conservative Group on 30 August 2018.

The Council noted that, on 20 September 2018, Councillors McShee and Rooth gave notice in writing to the proper officer of their wish to form a political group, namely the “Independent Group”, of which Councillor Rooth was the group leader.

The political balance on the Council was now:

Conservatives: 32  
 Liberal Democrats: 9  
 Guildford Greenbelt Group: 3  
 Labour: 2  
 Independent Group: 2

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

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

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

RESOLVED: That the calculation of numerical allocation of seats on committees to each political group as set out in Appendix 1 to the Order Paper circulated at the meeting, and summarised below, be approved.

Committee	Con	Lib Dem	G G G	Labour	Ind Group
Corp Gov & Standards	5	1	0	0	1
Employment	2	1	0	0	0
Community EAB	8	2	0	1	1
Place-Making EAB	8	2	1	0	1
Guildford Joint	7	2	1	0	1
Licensing	10	3	1	1	0
Overview & Scrutiny	8	2	1	1	0
Planning	10	3	1	1	0

Reasons:

- To comply with Council Procedure Rule 23 of the Constitution in respect of the appointment of committees
- To enable the Council to comply with its obligations under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 in respect of the political proportionality on its committees.

Recorded Vote:

The result of the recorded vote taken on the motion was 23 councillors voting in favour, 4 against, and 13 abstentions, as follows:

**FOR:**

Councillor Richard Billington  
 Councillor Philip Brooker  
 Councillor Adrian Chandler  
 Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield  
 Councillor Geoff Davis  
 Councillor Matt Furniss  
 Councillor Andrew Gomm  
 Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr.  
 Councillor Angela Gunning  
 Councillor Christian Holliday  
 Councillor Gordon Jackson  
 Councillor Jennifer Jordan  
 Councillor Sheila Kirkland  
 Councillor Nigel Manning  
 Councillor Marsha Moseley  
 Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith  
 Councillor Mike Piper  
 Councillor David Quelch  
 Councillor Jo Randall  
 Councillor Iseult Roche  
 Councillor Paul Spooner  
 Councillor James Walsh  
 Councillor David Wright

**AGAINST:**

Councillor Colin Cross  
 Councillor Bob McShee  
 Councillor Susan Parker  
 Councillor Tony Rooth

**ABSTAIN:**

Councillor Nils Christiansen  
 Councillor Angela Goodwin  
 Councillor David Goodwin  
 Councillor Gillian Harwood  
 Councillor Liz Hogger  
 Councillor Mike Hurdle  
 Councillor Julia McShane  
 Councillor Mike Parsons  
 Councillor Tony Phillips  
 Councillor David Reeve  
 Councillor Caroline Reeves  
 Councillor Pauline Searle  
 Councillor Jenny Wicks

**CO46 REVIEW OF THE PUBLIC SPEAKING PROCEDURE RULES INCLUDING THE PETITION SCHEME**

The Council considered a report on a number of proposed revisions to the Public Speaking Procedure Rules in Part 4 of the Constitution, which had been proposed in order to improve clarity and consistency, and in particular to address issues on which the Rules were silent.

The review had also proposed some amendments to the Council's Petition Scheme, in order to address data protection issues arising from the introduction of the General Data Protection Regulation, and to make provision within the Scheme for the separate procedures for dealing with petitions by the new Guildford Joint Committee.

Details of the proposed amendments to Public Speaking Procedure Rules and Petition Scheme were set out, by way of tracked changes, in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council.

The proposals had also been considered by the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee at its meeting on 20 September 2018. The Committee had supported the proposed amendments.

The Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, proposed, and the Deputy Mayor, and Chairman of the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, Councillor Richard Billington seconded the adoption of the following motion:

“That the proposed revisions to the Council's Public Speaking Procedure Rules and Petition Scheme, as set out in the report submitted to the Council and at Appendix 1 thereto, be adopted.”

Following the debate on the motion, Councillor Tony Rooth proposed, and Councillor Bob McShee seconded the following amendment:

“That, before any decision is taken in respect of the proposed revisions to the Council's Public Speaking Procedure Rules and Petition Scheme, the Council agrees to establish a cross party task and finish group (including the Independent Group) of up to eight councillors, whose terms of reference shall be:

- (a) to review the Public Speaking Procedure Rules generally and in particular:
  - (i) whether public speakers should be limited to 3 minutes each
  - (ii) whether use of visual aids should apply across all committees
  - (iii) whether a member of the public should only be allowed to ask one question at a meeting
  - (iv) whether a maximum total of 6 public speakers on one agenda item be allowed at all committees
  - (v) the approach to petitions to the council now that the Guildford Joint Committee will accept petitions with 30 signatories or more

and, following that review

- (b) to make recommendations as appropriate to the Council at its meeting on 6 February 2019.”

The Council agreed to take a recorded vote in respect of the amendment being proposed. The result of the recorded vote taken on the amendment was 5 councillors voting in favour, 27 against, and 8 abstentions, as follows:

**FOR:**

Councillor Mike Hurdle  
 Councillor Bob McShee  
 Councillor Susan Parker  
 Councillor David Reeve  
 Councillor Tony Rooth

**AGAINST:**

Councillor Richard Billington  
 Councillor Philip Brooker  
 Councillor Adrian Chandler  
 Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield  
 Councillor Nils Christiansen  
 Councillor Geoff Davis  
 Councillor Matt Furniss  
 Councillor Andrew Gomm  
 Councillor Angela Goodwin  
 Councillor Angela Gunning  
 Councillor Gillian Harwood  
 Councillor Liz Hogger  
 Councillor Christian Holliday  
 Councillor Gordon Jackson  
 Councillor Jennifer Jordan  
 Councillor Nigel Manning  
 Councillor Marsha Moseley  
 Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith  
 Councillor Mike Piper  
 Councillor David Quelch  
 Councillor Jo Randall  
 Councillor Caroline Reeves  
 Councillor Iseult Roche  
 Councillor Paul Spooner  
 Councillor James Walsh  
 Councillor Jenny Wicks  
 Councillor David Wright

**ABSTAIN:**

Councillor Colin Cross  
 Councillor David Goodwin  
 Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr  
 Councillor Sheila Kirkland  
 Councillor Julia McShane  
 Councillor Mike Parsons  
 Councillor Tony Phillips  
 Councillor Pauline Searle

In considering the original motion, the Council

RESOLVED: That the proposed revisions to the Council's Public Speaking Procedure Rules and Petition Scheme, as set out in the report submitted to the Council and at Appendix 1 thereto, be adopted.

Reason:

To improve the general clarity and consistency of the Council's Public Speaking Procedure Rules.

**CO47 REVIEW OF COUNCILLORS' ALLOWANCES 2019 - APPOINTMENT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL**

The Council considered a report on the proposed appointment of an Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) to conduct the next full review of the Scheme of Councillors' Allowances in the summer of 2019 following the Local Elections.

In 2015, the membership of the IRP had been refreshed and a comprehensive review of councillor allowances had been undertaken with findings and recommendations reported to Council on 10 February 2016. At that meeting, the Council adopted the current Scheme of Allowances and determined that the allowances would be adjusted annually in line with the percentage increase in staff salaries until 2019, at which time the Scheme would be reviewed again by the IRP. A suggested timescale for the formal appointment of the IRP and undertaking the next review of the Scheme was set out in the report.

The 2015 IRP had comprised three independent persons, which was the minimum number required under the Regulations. The three existing members had confirmed they were willing to remain on the IRP for the 2019 review of allowances, subject to the Council's approval.

Following publication of the Council agenda, a résumé on each of the three current members of the Independent Remuneration Panel had been circulated to all councillors, and a copy placed in the Members' Room.

All three candidates had confirmed that they remained qualified to serve in this capacity as set out in the Regulations.

In order to ensure that the IRP remained quorate during the review, it was proposed that the Council should advertise for up to two additional IRP members.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nige Manning, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That Michael Burke, Vivienne Cameron, and Susan Tresman be appointed to the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel for a further period of four years commencing with the 2019-20 municipal year.
- (2) That the Democratic Services Manager be authorised to advertise for candidates from the general public and a wide range of organisations, including the local business community and voluntary organisations for up to two additional members of the IRP to serve for a period of four years and conduct the next review of borough councillors' allowances and the review of parish allowances within the Borough.
- (3) That the Democratic Services Manager, the Lead Councillors for Infrastructure & Governance and Finance & Asset Management, and the Director of Finance, be authorised to shortlist, interview, and recommend for selection up to two nominees for appointment to the IRP.
- (4) That the proposed timetable for appointment of the IRP and review of allowances set out in paragraph 4.11 of the report submitted to the Council, be approved.
- (5) That the honorarium to be paid to each Panel member in respect of their four-year term of office remains unchanged at £500.
- (6) That the IRP elects its own Chairman.

Reason:

In order to comply with the requirements of The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended).

**CO48 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 27 SEPTEMBER 2018 FROM COUNCILLOR TONY ROTH**

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Tony Rooth proposed, and Councillor Bob McShee seconded, the adoption of the following motion:

"This Council fully supports the principles underlying the Local Government Transparency Code. The three key principles are democracy, accountability, and transparency which includes the requirement that all data held and managed by the Council should be made freely available in a manner which is demand-led, open, and timely to enable local people to contribute to the local decision making process and help shape public services.

In order to ensure that the Council is meeting its important obligations in this regard, the Council agrees to the establishment of an external independent review of the Council's compliance with the Code and its principles reporting back to Overview and Scrutiny Committee and then the Executive by 31 January 2019 at the latest in order to give time for the review's findings to be taken into account in the 2019-20 Budget."

Following the debate on the motion, it was put to the vote and was lost.

**CO49 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 27 SEPTEMBER 2018 FROM COUNCILLOR NILS CHRISTIANSEN**

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Nils Christiansen to proposed, and Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield seconded, the adoption of the following motion:

"This Council considers that the long term health and wellbeing of our residents is a priority. We are fortunate that Guildford residents are already amongst the healthiest and longest lived in the country, but our ambition is higher. Simply put, we want our residents to lead the longest, healthiest, and happiest lives they can, which we will measure by comparing our population health outcomes with the best in the world.

We recognise the important role of a well-functioning health system in achieving this, but understand that the wider determinants of health are ultimately more important in achieving improved population outcomes. These can often be heavily influenced by the day-to-day decisions we all make. To achieve significant change we need both an integrated approach to health and care, and a system-wide focus on the wider determinants of health.

In order to achieve this, the Council resolves to ensure that due consideration is given in all decision making as to how any decision will promote and support the improved health and wellbeing of residents."

Following the debate on the motion, it was put to the vote and was carried.

**CO50 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE**

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 17 July, 28 August, and 4 September 2018.

**CO51 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

Upon the Motion of the Mayor, Councillor Mike Parsons, seconded by the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington, the Council

RESOLVED:

That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraphs 1 and 4 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

**CO52 USE OF URGENT POWERS DELEGATED TO THE MANAGING DIRECTOR**

In accordance with the requirement of paragraph 2 of the Responsibilities and Powers of the Managing Director/Head of Paid Service in the scheme of delegation to officers in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution, the Council received a report on the use of urgent powers exercised by the Managing Director on 10 September 2018 for the following purposes:

- (a) agreeing a virement of £1.4 million from the approved capital contingency fund (FS1) to the approved budget (Scheme P9c) for the acquisition of a town centre property; and
- (b) authorising the Director of Community Services, in consultation with the Director of Environment and Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management to complete the acquisition.

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: That the urgent action taken by the Managing Director, as described in the report submitted to the Council, be noted.

Reason:

To comply with the requirement of paragraph 2 of the Responsibilities and Powers of the Managing Director/Head of Paid Service in the scheme of delegation to officers in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution.

**CO53 INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITY UPDATE**

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: That the update report from the Director of Finance be noted.

**CO54 COMMON SEAL**

The Council

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

The meeting finished at 10.28 pm

Signed .....  
Mayor

Date .....