

GUILDFORD BOROUGH COUNCIL

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

* Councillor Mike Parsons (Mayor)

* Councillor Richard Billington (Deputy Mayor)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| * Councillor David Bilbé | * Councillor Nigel Kears |
| * Councillor Philip Brooker | * Councillor Sheila Kirkland |
| * Councillor Adrian Chandler | * Councillor Nigel Manning |
| * Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield | Councillor Julia McShane |
| * Councillor Nils Christiansen | * Councillor Bob McShee |
| * Councillor Colin Cross | Councillor Marsha Moseley |
| * Councillor Geoff Davis | * Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith |
| * Councillor Graham Ellwood | * Councillor Susan Parker |
| * Councillor David Elms | * Councillor Dennis Paul |
| * Councillor Matt Furniss | * Councillor Tony Phillips |
| Councillor Andrew Gomm | * Councillor Mike Piper |
| * Councillor Angela Goodwin | * Councillor David Quelch |
| * Councillor David Goodwin | Councillor Jo Randall |
| * Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr | * Councillor David Reeve |
| * Councillor Angela Gunning | * Councillor Caroline Reeves |
| * Councillor Gillian Harwood | Councillor Iseult Roche |
| * Councillor Liz Hogger | * Councillor Tony Rooth |
| * Councillor Christian Holliday | * Councillor Matthew Sarti |
| * Councillor Liz Hooper | Councillor Pauline Searle |
| * Councillor Mike Hurdle | * Councillor Paul Spooner |
| Councillor Michael Illman | * Councillor James Walsh |
| * Councillor Gordon Jackson | * Councillor Jenny Wicks |
| * Councillor Jennifer Jordan | * Councillor David Wright |

*Present

Honorary Freeman Jen Powell and Honorary Aldermen T Baker, K Childs, T Patrick, and M A H M Williamson were also in attendance.

CO55 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andrew Gomm, Julia McShane, Marsha Moseley, Jo Randall, Iseult Roche, and Pauline Searle, and from Honorary Aldermen Mrs C F Copley, Mrs C F P Griffin, J Marks, B Parke, and L Strudwick.

CO56 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

CO57 MINUTES

The Council confirmed, as a correct record, the minutes of the Council Meeting held on 9 October 2018. The Mayor signed the minutes.

CO58 MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor reported that the first Guildford Lottery draw took place on Saturday 1 December 2018, with 820 players buying 1,930 weekly tickets supporting 81 good causes.

Although that was a very good start, the Mayor hoped that before the end of the year the number of players might reach 1,000 with 2,500 tickets sold and 100 good causes supported. The Mayor asked councillors to register with the Lottery, if they had not already registered, and also promote the Guildford Lottery amongst friends, colleagues and contacts.

The Mayor commented on how pleased he was by the level of support he had received for his charitable causes so far this year, especially for the new Guildford Young Carers Fund, although there was much work still to be done. The Mayor invited councillors to attend a number of events in 2019, details of which were included on the flyer circulated to councillors before the meeting.

CO59 LEADER'S COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications from the Leader.

CO60 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Zöe Franklin addressed the Council in support of the motion referred to in agenda item 15. The Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner responded to the representations.

CO61 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

(a) Councillor Nils Christiansen asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the following question:

“In light of the new policy S3 recommended by the Planning Inspector, and given the ongoing pressure from uncoordinated, speculative development in Guildford Town Centre, will the lead member please confirm that a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will be prepared for Guildford Town Centre once the Local Plan has been approved? Assuming this is still the intention, please confirm:

- The intended geographical boundary of the SPD (will this be the area in the Town Centre Regeneration Strategy (TCRS))?
- How the Council will ensure a masterplanned scheme can still come forward, if the area identified in the TCRS is not specifically allocated in the Local Plan?
- That the uses in the TCRS are consistent with the Local Plan in all areas such that an SPD would actually be lawful?
- The anticipated date when a Town Centre SPD will be available for public consultation?”

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

“Policy S3 is a general policy stating an intent on behalf of the Council to maximise the potential of the town centre and to contribute further development both commercial, retail and residential in a way that respects the character and views of the town and enhances the public realm. It also requires that development proposals are coordinated and that individual sites are not considered in isolation. There are further policies within the draft Local Plan - both allocations and general policies - that will be used to assess planning applications that come forward in the town centre. The Council is also producing a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in relation to Strategic Views into and out of the town centre that will provide context for new major applications.

The Council's approach to the regeneration of the Town Centre is based both on statutory planning documents and documents such as the Town Centre Regeneration Strategy (TCRS) that sit outside the planning system. Policy S3 does not refer to the production of a Town Centre SPD. Those town centre sites that are considered to be

developable within the lifetime of the Plan have been included as allocations. Those sites that have greater uncertainty will be progressed outside of the strategic plan. It is key to understand that SPDs cannot allocate sites – that is new policy and outside the scope of an SPD. If it was considered necessary to allocate additional sites in the town centre, this could only be achieved through a new Development Plan Document (DPD).

This is why reference is made in para 4.1.17 of the Main Modifications Plan to the possibility of a future Area Action Plan (a DPD). Assuming it was decided to produce an Area Action Plan for the town centre, an area would need to be defined. The town centre, as defined on the policies map, would be the obvious starting point; however, this excludes Woodbridge Meadows so a wider area could be contemplated.

The allocations and designations contained in the existing plan would all be up for reconsideration as would the allocation of new sites. For all the discussion at the Examination, it was agreed by all that there are no brownfield sites that are capable of being delivered within the next five years. Unless this situation changes significantly, it would not be appropriate, therefore, to embark upon the production of an Area Action Plan. Relevant parts of the evidence base would also need updating and the whole Local Plan process of Regulation 18 and 19 consultations would need to be undertaken. As we know this is neither a quick nor cheap process.

The Council is progressing a number of sites contained in the TCRS that are not included in the Local Plan due to uncertainty over their delivery. These sites will be considered within the context set by the existing policies in the Local Plan and national guidance and the emerging Development Management policies. This is not uncommon. A local plan represents a set of circumstances at a particular time and situations change over time. The Town Centre Views SPD will be consulted on in the New Year.

In summary, it is not intended to produce an SPD in relation to the town centre as a whole. The Council has allocated sites for development within the town centre in the Local Plan and continues to work on bringing other sites forward via the Major Projects Team”.

Councillor Paul Spooner
Leader of the Council

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

“Would the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance please answer the following questions in respect of the Walnut Bridge project:

- (i) What is the breakdown of the costs incurred on this project to date and what is the works schedule and related financial budget for the completion of the bridge installation?
- (ii) What were the quotes from the other potential designers/contractors during the bidding stage?
- (iii) When are the scheduled dates for commencement and completion of the entire installation?
- (iv) Will use of the waterway be halted during the installation process and will this closure be extended to the surrounding areas? (please outline the safety measures required to protect the public at these times)

- (v) What will be put in place to facilitate the continued safe movement of all current users who utilise the current bridge?"

The Lead Councillor's response was as follows:

"In response to part (i) of the question, I can confirm that costs Incurred on this project to date are £1,202,300. The majority of spend to date is related to the feasibility, design and planning for the replacement bridge.

The total budget for the project is: £3,341,000. The budget is made up of Local Enterprise Partnership Grant funding of £1,535,000 and Local Authority Funding of £1,806,000. The Local Authority Funding includes S106 contributions.

The anticipated financial budget for the completion of the bridge installation is outlined in the table below – Note: this is subject to change and also includes costs that have been incurred to date.

Item	Current report total (VAT not applicable)
Construction	£1,134,390
Professional fees (incl. legal fees)	£1,091,444
GBC direct costs	£388,561
Optimism bias	£339,386
Employer's risk	£142,000
Purchase of PZR Land in 2015 (Western Abutment on Walnut Tree Close)	£120,000
Pre-construction ground surveys	£115,219
Statutory diversions	£10,000
Total	£3,341,000

In relation to part (ii) of the question, under the previous Design and Build procurement process in respect of the Cable Stay bridge (in late 2017 and early 2018), no definitive proposals were received.

The complexity of the design would have required significant resources to design to a stage whereby a quote could be prepared, which suppliers were not prepared to take on as an upfront risk. The suppliers wanted the Council to cover the costs and risk of completing the detailed design process for them to be able to provide a quote. The Council would have had to pay for all the design costs incurred by both interested companies prior to tender submission.

As a result, the procurement process was temporarily halted to review the alternatives available to the Council.

The Council chose to proceed with preparing its own design in order to remove the risk from the project. The Designers – Arcadis & Knight Architects were appointed following an open, competitive tendering process under the East Shires Procurement Organisation (ESPO) framework.

The design was granted permission in October 2018.

The Council is now preparing for the procurement of a 'Build Only' contractor to deliver the approved design.

In relation to part (iii) of the question, we are aiming to complete the procurement exercise in January/February 2019, with a view to commencement as soon as possible thereafter. The construction period will be approximately 14 months.

In relation to part (iv) of the question, the waterway will be closed for two short periods during the works. There will be two main aspects of the construction works - the placement of the new bridge and the removal of the existing bridge.

The new bridge deck will be fabricated off site and transported from the fabrication works to Bedford Wharf when ready. It will be craned on to the bridge abutments (supports), which will have already been built and made ready. The old bridge will be removed once the new bridge is usable.

The actual timing and duration of this activity is for the main contractor to determine subject to the approval of the project manager, the Council's technical advisors and interested parties, such as the National Trust. It is possible that these lifts will be scheduled to happen at night to minimise disruption.

In addition to the temporary closure of the River Wey Navigation, it will also be necessary to temporarily close the towpath and existing footbridge during the bridge lifts. Access for the public to the Bedford Wharf area will also be restricted during this time.

Safety Measures:

This project is subject to the Construction and Design Management Regulations 2015 (CDM2015). As such, all safety measures are the responsibility of the Principal Contractor whether for site personnel or the public at large. The contractor will produce a health and safety plan that will be subject to the approval of the Council's technical advisors. The Council has appointed Arcadis Consulting (UK) Ltd as Principal Designer under CDM 2015.

We will also be liaising closely with the National Trust.

In relation to part (v) of the question, a detailed construction sequence has been developed which endeavours to minimise disruption to the public's use of the existing footbridge, Bedford Wharf, Walnut Tree Close and surrounding businesses and residents. Construction operations have been sequenced to provide pedestrian routes that will be maintained across the river and Bedford Wharf.

The use of night-time construction operations has been specified to minimise traffic disruption to Walnut Tree Close, the station and the users of the current bridge. The public will be physically separated from the construction works by hoardings to ensure the site is secure at all times.

Pedestrian routes around the works sites will be well signposted and illuminated for security and safety purposes. Information on changes to these routes will be provided to the public ahead of time.

During the two main operations, lifting in the new bridge and lifting out the old bridge, the current route will be closed to the public temporarily during these specific events for as short a duration as possible.

The Council will work with interested parties and co-located businesses to minimise any temporary impacts arising from the works, and to ensure that they are able to continue unaffected”.

Councillor Matt Furniss
Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance

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

“Would the Leader of the Council please answer the following questions in respect of the Wisley Garden Village Bid process:

- (i) Given that the bid document lists a number of co-participants in the preparation of the bid, who was the primary author who bears the ultimate responsibility for its contents?
- (ii) The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) Invitation to bid was received and discussed at GBC in mid-August and it contained the strongly worded advice that any applicants should "have early and regular contact and discussions" with them throughout the bid process. Why then was the only contact with Ministry officials made on 5 November, only days before the deadline for submission of bids? Why did GBC ignore this clear steer?”

The Leader’s response was as follows:

“In response to part (i) of the question, I can confirm that Guildford Borough Council is the lead authority for the submission of the bid.

In relation to part (ii) of the question, there was a brief exchange of emails in mid-August between the Director of Planning and Regeneration and myself regarding whether this was something that the Council would consider supporting in principle. I indicated my agreement to this approach on 20 August. However, no further work was undertaken on preparing the bid until I agreed on 19 October to refer the matter formally to the Executive on 30 October for agreement to submit a bid. A period of early engagement was therefore not possible and, given this was an expectation rather than a requirement, it was considered appropriate given the circumstances to submit the bid without this.

As set out in para 33 of the prospectus, garden communities will be selected based on those which best meet the criteria. It also goes on to say that, if necessary, MHCLG may carry out a period of further engagement once proposals have been submitted to collect the evidence necessary for a decision to be made. For this reason, we do not think that the failure to have undertaken early engagement with MHCLG will have an impact on whether we are successful at achieving garden village status or not”.

Councillor Paul Spooner
Leader of the Council

- (d) Councillor Bob McShee asked the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner, the question set out below.

“Can the Leader of the Council please update the Council on the possible establishment of a trade office for China in Guildford as he mentioned at the last

Council meeting, and have there been any further discussions with our partner city Dongying?”

The Leader’s response was as follows:

“As I said to Councillor McShee at the last Council meeting on 9 October 2018, we are undertaking some work to explore how we can deliver economic benefits from the relationships developed in Dongying and Beijing, including the potential for a trade office in Guildford.

We anticipate that this study will be completed in early 2019 and the findings will be reported to the Town Twinning Working Group for consideration.

Further discussions with Dongying and other relevant parties in China will follow as appropriate.”

Councillor Paul Spooner
Leader of the Council

- (e) Councillor Bob McShee asked the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance, Councillor Matt Furniss, the question set out below.

“I would like to ask the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance if Chapel Street is to be resurfaced or replaced? If so, when would the works be undertaken and what is the budget for the project? If there are planned works to Chapel Street will local businesses be compensated for any loss in income?”

The Lead Councillor’s response was as follows:

“The Council has a 'live' project relating to improvements to the public realm in the town centre, including Chapel Street, and has recently appointed a Project Manager to take this forward.

The scheme is still at a very early stage and no detailed designs have yet been drawn up or agreed. However, this scheme will be the subject of wide public consultation, including with local business owners. It is currently envisaged that the enhancements would be implemented in the second half of 2019.

We have £1.135m remaining in the Provisional Capital Budget, already approved by Full Council, to take forward public realm enhancements to both Chapel Street and Castle Street. The likely cost of works in Chapel Street will not be known until the project has been worked up in detail; however, it will almost certainly be a smaller proportion of the remaining capital budget than the works in Castle Street, which is wider and longer. Costs will also be less as we aim to reuse all existing historical materials, where possible, in order to maintain the character of Chapel Street.

We would seek to limit any detrimental impact on local trade and, indeed, the improvement works will make this a more attractive area for shoppers and leisure users, thereby supporting local businesses. To date, there has been no discussion on the issue of compensation.”

Councillor Matt Furniss
Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance

- (f) Councillor Tony Rooth asked the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance, Councillor Matt Furniss, the question set out below.

“Would the Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance please provide the total cost and breakdown of highway, paving and other works performed in Tunsgate including consultancy expenses, specifically:

- (i) cost per square metre of the total cost of these works;
- (ii) dates of start and finish of these works;
- (iii) what were the coloured bricks made of and were they laid out in a specified layout, almost brick by brick, and if so why was this required, how much extra did it cost and how much longer did such specialised work prolong completion;
- (iv) estimated total loss of business and other costs incurred by local businesses as result of these works;
- (v) total amount of compensation paid to local businesses;
- (vi) what financial and other contribution(s) to these works are made by third parties such as Surrey County Council, developers and businesses in Tunsgate Quarter?”

The Lead Councillor’s response was as follows:

“The total construction cost of the scheme currently stands at £610,625 and the cost for developing the design package was £130,000, out of a budget of £835,000.

The costs are broken down as follows:

Kerbs and pavement:	£250,300
Earthworks:	£184,541
Approvals /consultants:	£130,000
Variations:	£125,847
Drainage:	£39,997
Fencing and security	£5,644
Lighting:	£2,971
Site clearance:	<u>£1,325</u>
	<u>£740,625</u>

In response to the specific questions:

- (i) The cost per square metre of the total cost of these works was approximately £618.
- (ii) The works were undertaken between August 2017 and October 2018 (with a break between January and June 2018 whilst works on the Tunsgate Centre were being completed)
- (iii) The new blocks are granite and were manually laid in a specific pattern in accordance with the design brief that best reflects the historic cobbled Guildford High Street.
- (iv) This public realm scheme of improvement works have made this a more attractive area for shoppers and leisure users, thereby supporting local businesses. We hold no information about individual business’ financial status.
- (v) No compensation has been paid to local businesses and no claims for compensation have been received.
- (vi) There have been no financial contributions to these works from third parties, but there has been a great deal of goodwill and co-operation from all parties involved”.

Councillor Matt Furniss
Lead Councillor for Infrastructure and Governance

CO62 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 Colin Cross' resignation from the Liberal Democrat Group on 30 October 2018. On 15 November 2018, the proper officer received notice in writing from Councillor Cross of his wish to join the Independent Group. In a separate notice received on the same date, Councillor Tony Rooth, as group leader, gave notice in writing to the proper officer of their wish to form a political group, confirmed that the name of the Independent Group had changed to "The Independent Alliance".

The political balance on the Council was now:

Conservatives: 32
Liberal Democrats: 8
Guildford Greenbelt Group: 3
Independent Alliance: 3
Labour: 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, together with any amendments.

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

That the Council approves the calculation of numerical allocation of seats on committees to each political group for the remainder of the 2018-19 municipal year, as set out in Option 1 (Appendix 3 to the report submitted to the Council), and summarised below:

Committee	Con	Lib Dem	GGG	Ind Alliance	Labour
Corp Gov & Standards	5	1	0	1	0
Employment	2	1	0	0	0
Community EAB	8	2	0	1	1
Place-Making EAB	8	2	1	1	0
Guildford Joint	7	2	1	1	0
Licensing	10	2	1	1	1
Overview & Scrutiny	8	2	1	0	1
Planning	10	3	1	0	1
Total no. of seats on committees	58	15	5	5	4

Following the debate on the motion, Councillor Tony Rooth proposed, and Councillor Colin Cross seconded the following amendment (No.1):

"In Option 1:

- (a) delete the proposed seat on the Place Making and Innovation EAB allocated to the Independent Alliance and allocate that seat instead to the Labour group;
- (b) delete the proposed seat on the Planning Committee to the Labour group and allocate that seat instead to the independent Alliance.”

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

The result of the recorded vote taken on this amendment was 5 councillors voting in favour, 32 against, and 4 abstentions, as follows:

FOR:

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

AGAINST:

Councillor David Bilbé
Councillor Richard Billington
Councillor Philip Brooker
Councillor Adrian Chandler
Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield
Councillor Nils Christiansen
Councillor Geoff Davis
Councillor Graham Ellwood
Councillor David Elms
Councillor Matt Furniss
Councillor Angela Goodwin
Councillor David Goodwin
Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr.
Councillor Angela Gunning
Councillor Gillian Harwood
Councillor Liz Hogger
Councillor Christian Holliday
Councillor Gordon Jackson
Councillor Jennifer Jordan
Councillor Nigel Kearse
Councillor Nigel Manning
Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith
Councillor Dennis Paul
Councillor Tony Phillips
Councillor Mike Piper
Councillor David Quelch
Councillor Caroline Reeves
Councillor Matt Sarti
Councillor Paul Spooner
Councillor James Walsh
Councillor Jenny Wicks
Councillor David Wright

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Mike Hurdle
Councillor Sheila Kirkland
Councillor Mike Parsons
Councillor David Reeve

Councillor Jenny Wicks proposed, and Councillor Nils Christiansen seconded the following amendment (No.2):

“In Option 1:

- (a) allocate a seat on the Planning Committee to the Independent Alliance and reduce the Liberal Democrat Group’s allocation on that committee by one seat; and
- (b) remove the proposed seat on the Licensing Committee to the Independent Alliance and increase the Liberal Democrat Group’s allocation on that committee by one seat.”

The Council noted that this amendment represented Option 2 as set out in Appendix 4 to the report submitted to the Council.

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

The result of the recorded vote taken on this amendment was 12 councillors voting in favour, 27 against, and 2 abstentions, as follows:

FOR:

Councillor Nils Christiansen
Councillor Colin Cross
Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr.
Councillor Christian Holliday
Councillor Liz Hooper
Councillor Sheila Kirkland
Councillor Bob McShee
Councillor Susan Parker
Councillor David Reeve
Councillor Tony Rooth
Councillor Matt Sarti
Councillor Jenny Wicks

AGAINST:

Councillor David Bilbé
Councillor Richard Billington
Councillor Philip Brooker
Councillor Adrian Chandler
Councillor Geoff Davis
Councillor Graham Ellwood
Councillor David Elms
Councillor Matt Furniss
Councillor Angela Goodwin
Councillor David Goodwin
Councillor Angela Gunning
Councillor Gillian Harwood
Councillor Liz Hogger
Councillor Mike Hurdle
Councillor Gordon Jackson
Councillor Jennifer Jordan
Councillor Nigel Kearse
Councillor Nigel Manning
Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith
Councillor Dennis Paul
Councillor Tony Phillips
Councillor Mike Piper
Councillor David Quelch
Councillor Caroline Reeves
Councillor Paul Spooner
Councillor James Walsh
Councillor David Wright

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield
Councillor Mike Parsons

In consideration of the original motion, the Council took a further recorded vote and

RESOLVED: That the Council approves the calculation of numerical allocation of seats on committees to each political group for the remainder of the 2018-19 municipal year, as set out in Option 1 (Appendix 3 to the report submitted to the Council), and summarised below:

Committee	Con	Lib Dem	GGG	Ind Alliance	Labour
Corp Gov & Standards	5	1	0	1	0
Employment	2	1	0	0	0
Community EAB	8	2	0	1	1
Place-Making EAB	8	2	1	1	0
Guildford Joint	7	2	1	1	0
Licensing	10	2	1	1	1
Overview & Scrutiny	8	2	1	0	1
Planning	10	3	1	0	1
Total no. of seats on committees	58	15	5	5	4

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.

The result of the recorded vote taken on the original motion was 31 councillors voting in favour, 6 against, and 4 abstentions, as follows:

FOR:

Councillor David Bilbé
 Councillor Richard Billington
 Councillor Philip Brooker
 Councillor Adrian Chandler
 Councillor Alexandra Chesterfield
 Councillor Geoff Davis
 Councillor Graham Ellwood
 Councillor David Elms
 Councillor Matt Furniss
 Councillor Angela Goodwin
 Councillor David Goodwin
 Councillor Angela Gunning
 Councillor Gillian Harwood
 Councillor Liz Hogger
 Councillor Christian Holliday
 Councillor Liz Hooper
 Councillor Mike Hurdle
 Councillor Gordon Jackson
 Councillor Jennifer Jordan
 Councillor Nigel Kearsé
 Councillor Sheila Kirkland
 Councillor Nigel Manning
 Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith
 Councillor Dennis Paul
 Councillor Tony Phillips
 Councillor Mike Piper
 Councillor David Quelch
 Councillor Caroline Reeves
 Councillor Paul Spooner
 Councillor James Walsh
 Councillor David Wright

AGAINST:

Councillor Nils Christiansen
 Councillor Colin Cross
 Councillor Murray Grubb Jnr.
 Councillor Bob McShee
 Councillor Tony Rooth
 Councillor Jenny Wicks

ABSTAIN:

Councillor Susan Parker
 Councillor Mike Parsons
 Councillor David Reeve
 Councillor Matt Sarti

CO63 LOCAL COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2019-20

The Council received a report on its statutory duty to consider annually whether to revise its Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTSS), replace it with another or make no changes. The Council was obliged to consult with interested parties if it wished to revise or replace the scheme. In addition, the Council had to approve a scheme for the 2019-20 financial year by 31 January 2019.

In 2018-19, a number of minor changes were made to the scheme. For 2019-20, it was proposed to introduce the following changes, which could be met from within the existing revenue budget:

- Increase Premiums to ensure that the help given does not unduly reduce due to inflation.
- Increase Non-Dependant Deductions to reflect an expectation that their contribution to the household expenses should increase each year.
- Update Income and Capital Disregards to include “the London Emergencies Trust” and the “We Love Manchester Emergency Fund”. This mirrored the government’s change to the Pension Age scheme, and honoured the intention that help from these funds was to provide for exceptional circumstances. It also ensured that claimants were treated consistently across all schemes.

A stakeholder consultation was held between 24 September and 22 October 2018, the results of which were set out in the report. The results supported the proposed changes.

Councillors noted that the Council continued to operate in a tough financial climate and that its medium term financial plan position remained challenging. However, it was recognised that passing on further savings via the LCTS scheme in 2019-20 would place additional financial pressure on vulnerable households. A discretionary hardship fund would help support any resident suffering adversely from the consequences of savings in welfare support over the past five years, in addition to the proposed changes for 2019-20.

The Executive had considered the report at its meeting on 27 November 2018 and had endorsed the recommendation therein.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Housing and Environment, Councillor Philip Brooker, seconded by the Lead Councillor for Finance and Asset Management, Councillor Nigel Manning, the Council

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the current Local Council Tax Support Scheme be amended for 2019-20, as set out in detail in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, with effect from 1 April 2019.
- (2) That the Council maintains a discretionary hardship fund of £40,000 in 2019-20.

Reasons:

- (1) To ensure that the Council complies with government legislation to implement a LCTS scheme from 1 April 2019.
- (2) To maintain a discretionary fund to help applicants suffering from severe financial hardship.

CO64 ADOPTION OF WEST 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 West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan, which had been produced by West Horsley Parish Council for the West Horsley Neighbourhood Area (West 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 22 November 2018. Nearly 96% of those voting at the referendum had voted "Yes".

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 Jenny Wicks, the Council

RESOLVED: That the Council approves the West 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).

CO65 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEWS: EAST AND WEST CLANDON PARISH COUNCILS

The Council considered a report setting out the results of a public consultation on the community governance review in respect of Normandy Parish Council, specifically the proposal for an increase in the number of elected parish councillors from the present number of seven to nine. The report had also set out the criteria that the Council must consider when determining a community governance review, notably, that the Council's recommendations should provide effective and convenient governance and reflect the interests of the local community.

The report also included a set of recommendations and options to enable the Council to determine the community governance review in accordance with the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 and government guidance.

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

RESOLVED:

(1) That, taking account of the statutory considerations:

- (a) the number of parish councillors to be elected to East Clandon Parish Council be increased from five to six with effect from May 2019;
- (b) the number of parish councillors to be elected to West Clandon Parish Council be increased from six to eight with effect from May 2019; and
- (c) the recommendation contained in the respective terms of reference for each review that no other changes should be made to the electoral arrangements for East Clandon Parish Council and West Clandon Parish Council, be approved.

(2) That the Democratic Services Manager be authorised:

- (a) 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:
 - (i) the increase in the number of parish councillors to be elected to East Clandon Parish Council from five to six with effect from May 2019;
 - (ii) the increase in the number of parish councillors to be elected to West Clandon Parish Council from six to eight with effect from May 2019; and

- (iii) all necessary incidental, consequential, transitional or supplementary provisions as may be required to give full effect to the order; and
- (b) to inform, as soon as practicable after the community governance reorganisation order has been made, the appropriate authorities as set out in paragraph 10.5 (ii) of the report submitted to the Council.

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.

CO66 GAMBLING ACT 2005: STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES 2019-2022

Councillors noted that the Gambling Act 2005 required the Council as licensing authority to prepare and publish a Statement of Principles every three years. The existing Statement of Principles was due for renewal by January 2019.

The 12 week public consultation approved by the Licensing Committee on 30 May 2018 had been conducted and details of the six responses received were set out in the report submitted to the Council which included, as an Appendix, the final version of the Statement of Principles for adoption by the Council.

The report and the draft Statement of Principles had been considered by the Licensing Committee at its meeting on 28 November 2018. The Committee had recommended adoption of the Statement.

Upon the motion of the Lead Councillor for Licensing, Environmental Health and Community Safety, Councillor Graham Ellwood, seconded by Councillor David Elms, the Council

RESOLVED: That the Gambling Act 2005 Statement of Principles 2019-2022, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report submitted to the Council, be adopted with effect from 1 January 2019.

Reason:

To comply with the requirements of the Gambling Act 2005 the Council must prepare and publish a statement of principles for the period 2019-2022.

CO67 SELECTION OF THE MAYOR AND DEPUTY MAYOR 2019-20

The Council considered a report on nominations received for election of Mayor and appointment of Deputy Mayor for the municipal year 2019-20. The constitutional changes adopted by the Council as part of the review of the Civic Function in April 2014 in respect of the Mayoralty, provided that the Council would normally elect the Deputy Mayor appointed at the annual meeting of the Council as Mayor at the next succeeding annual meeting.

Political group leaders had been asked to submit nominations in respect of the Deputy Mayoralty for 2019-20. The only nomination received was Councillor Marsha Moseley.

Accordingly, the Council was asked to consider the nominations of Councillors Richard Billington and Marsha Moseley respectively for Mayor and Deputy Mayor in 2019-20, subject to the outcome of the Borough Council elections. Councillor Billington left the meeting during the Council's consideration of this matter.

Upon the motion of the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss, seconded by Councillor Caroline Reeves, the Council

RESOLVED: That, subject to the outcome of the Borough Council Elections in May 2019,

- (a) the Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richard Billington be nominated for the Mayoralty of the Borough for the 2019-20 municipal year; and
- (b) Councillor Marsha Moseley be nominated for the Deputy Mayoralty of the Borough for the 2019-20 municipal year.

Reason:

To make early preparations for the selection of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor for the 2018-19 municipal year.

CO68 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 21 NOVEMBER 2018

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11, Councillor Caroline Reeves proposed, and Councillor David Reeve seconded, the adoption of the following motion:

“This Council acknowledges that there is overwhelming evidence indicating that human activity has resulted in global climate change that threatens our future and those of generations to come. It is clear that we must all take significant steps to address our lifestyles immediately in order to slow and, in time, reverse this damage. In our position as a local authority, we have a crucial role to play in both leading by example and influencing the way that the residents and businesses of Guildford Borough live and work.

This Council is proud of the work undertaken by Officers and Members in recent years to start to address the causes and impact of Climate Change in Guildford Borough and beyond. As a Council, we have already worked on improving air quality and have achieved high recycling rates. However, there is much more that needs to be done and the Council acknowledges that effective action to address these issues will take time to implement. We cannot expect residents to change their habits if we are not prepared to lead by example in the fight against climate change for the sake of everyone in the borough both now and in the future.

This Council therefore resolves to set up an officer-led task group, to include interested councillors, drawing on expert external advice to provide informed policy input and practical suggestions of issues that this Council can and should be addressing going forward. This task group should report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee with the remit to make recommendations as appropriate to the Executive and Full Council”.

Following the debate on the motion, the Lead Councillor for Skills, Arts and Tourism, Councillor Nikki Nelson-Smith proposed, and the Lead Councillor for Innovation and Transformation, Councillor Gordon Jackson seconded the following amendment:

Substitute the following in place of the third paragraph:

“Recognising that the Innovation Strategy Board is already taking account of the most recent government policies and papers in the preparation of the Innovation Strategy, the Council resolves:

- (1) *That the Innovation Strategy Board be asked to establish a task group to be chaired by the Lead Councillor for Skills, Arts and Tourism, and to include the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and other interested councillors, drawing on expert external advice to provide informed policy input*

and practical suggestions of issues that this Council can and should be addressing going forward.

- (2) That this task group be requested to report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and to make recommendations as appropriate to the Executive and Full Council”*

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

In consideration of the substantive motion, the Council took a further vote and

RESOLVED: That the following substantive motion be adopted:

“This Council acknowledges that there is overwhelming evidence indicating that human activity has resulted in global climate change that threatens our future and those of generations to come. It is clear that we must all take significant steps to address our lifestyles immediately in order to slow and, in time, reverse this damage. In our position as a local authority, we have a crucial role to play in both leading by example and influencing the way that the residents and businesses of Guildford Borough live and work.

This Council is proud of the work undertaken by Officers and Members in recent years to start to address the causes and impact of Climate Change in Guildford Borough and beyond. As a Council, we have already worked on improving air quality and have achieved high recycling rates. However, there is much more that needs to be done and the Council acknowledges that effective action to address these issues will take time to implement. We cannot expect residents to change their habits if we are not prepared to lead by example in the fight against climate change for the sake of everyone in the borough both now and in the future.

Recognising that the Innovation Strategy Board is already taking account of the most recent government policies and papers in the preparation of the Innovation Strategy, the Council resolved:

- (1) That the Innovation Strategy Board be asked to establish a task group to be chaired by the Lead Councillor for Skills, Arts and Tourism, and to include the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and other interested councillors, drawing on expert external advice to provide informed policy input and practical suggestions of issues that this Council can and should be addressing going forward.*
- (2) That this task group be requested to report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and to make recommendations as appropriate to the Executive and Full Council”*

CO69 NOTICE OF MOTION DATED 22 NOVEMBER 2018

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

“This Council notes that a draft Brexit deal has been agreed between the UK Government and the European Commission. We acknowledge that sovereignty on this matter lies with Parliament, but the nature of the final deal will have a significant and long lasting impact on all our residents. Guildford’s EU Referendum result was strongly in favour of Remain, as opposed to the narrow margin nationally in favour of Leave.

Regardless of the outcome of the meaningful vote in Parliament, this Council resolves:

- (1) That the people should have scrutiny of what is being negotiated on their behalf and an opportunity to vote on the final Brexit deal, including the option to remain in the EU.
- (2) That the Leader of the Council be asked to write to the four MPs representing residents of this borough asking them to support a 'People's Vote'."

Following the debate on the motion, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Paul Spooner proposed, and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Matt Furniss seconded the following amendment:

- (a) Delete paragraph (1) of the proposed resolution within the motion
- (b) In paragraph (2), substitute the following in place of "*support a 'People's Vote'*":
"note the main sentiments of the meeting, together with any specific concerns raised by councillors in the debate, including in particular, a request that they urge the Government to ensure that, whatever the outcome, local government services to our residents are safeguarded."

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

In consideration of the substantive motion, the Council took a further vote and

RESOLVED: That the following substantive motion be adopted:

"This Council notes that a draft Brexit deal has been agreed between the UK Government and the European Commission. We acknowledge that sovereignty on this matter lies with Parliament, but the nature of the final deal will have a significant and long lasting impact on all our residents. Guildford's EU Referendum result was strongly in favour of Remain, as opposed to the narrow margin nationally in favour of Leave.

Regardless of the outcome of the meaningful vote in Parliament, this Council resolves:

That the Leader of the Council be asked to write to the four MPs representing residents of this borough asking them to note the main sentiments of the meeting, together with any specific concerns raised by councillors in the debate, including in particular, a request that they urge the Government to ensure that, whatever the outcome, local government services to our residents are safeguarded."

CO70 MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE

The Council received and noted the minutes of the meetings of the Executive held on 25 September and 30 October 2018.

CO71 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 10.25 pm

Signed

Mayor

Date